



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>













A FREE ENQUIRY  
INTO THE  
DIFFICULTIES SUGGESTED BY DR. COLENZO  
WITH RESPECT TO THE  
HISTORICAL VERACITY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY  
BENJAMIN BICKLEY ROGERS, M.A.,  
OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW;  
AND SOMETIME FELLOW OF WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD.

---

"They searched the Scriptures, whether those things were so."  
ACTS xvii. 11.

---

**PART I.**

---

Oxford and London:  
JOHN HENRY AND JAMES PARKER.  
1868.



Printed by Messrs. Parker, Cornmarket, Oxford.

## PREFACE.

---

IN the following pages I have left the facts and arguments to speak for themselves. I have made no appeal to the feelings or to the imagination of the reader; I have not endeavoured to enlist his sympathy on my behalf by any display of religious sentiment, or to excite his prejudice against an opposing theory by any suggestion of the consequences to which it might possibly be expected to lead. The simple question is "whether these things are so." Truth is no doubt to be sought regardless of consequences, and men must forget that they are responsible beings when they either reject as false that which in their hearts they secretly suspect to be true, or venture to accept as truth that which they fear to examine lest it be found a falsehood.

I have therefore treated the subject, not as a theological, but as a purely literary question. I have used no argument and taken up no ground which I might not equally have used or taken up had the question been whether in the *Iliad* or in the *Æneid*, or in any acknowledged work of fiction, there are or are not to be discovered incongruities, inconsistencies, absurdities, contradictions.

The question is simply as to the accuracy of the narrative *tried by its own standard*: it has no connection with those wider and deeper considerations—antiquarian, scientific, moral—on which our belief in the Pen-

tateuch, considered as a Divine Revelation, must mainly depend.

Still if Dr. Colenso's objections were worth making at all, they must also be worth considering; and as they are expressly addressed, not only to the laity in general, but in an especial manner to the most unlearned laymen, I trust that it will not be thought presumptuous if, having taken them to heart and carefully examined them, I venture to state the results of that examination.

I believe that I have made no assumption, taken nothing for granted, on the side of the defence. On the contrary, whenever I have not attempted to disprove, I have invariably adopted, the positions of Dr. Colenso, although they might carry no conviction to my own mind.

One request, and one only, I would make to the indulgence of the reader. It is that in perusing these pages he will keep Dr. Colenso's work and the Pentateuch itself by his side; that he will never rest content with my references and quotations, but examine for himself their accuracy, and their relation to the surrounding context.

I have reserved the objections which have a more direct and special bearing on the event of the Exodus for separate examination in a Second Part: the others, I believe, are all considered here.

The references are to the first edition of Dr. Colenso's work.

3, OLD SQUARE, LINCOLN'S INN,  
*May 5, 1863.*

# CONTENTS.

---

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	v
I. THE FAMILY OF JUDAH . . . . .	1
II. THE CONGREGATION AND THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE	18
III. MOSES ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL . . . . .	24
IV. JOSHUA ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL . . . . .	32
V. THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH THE PRIEST'S DUTIES . . . . .	35
VI. THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH THE DAILY NECESSITIES OF THE PEOPLE . . . . .	37
VII. THE IDENTITY OF THE NUMBERS IN EXODUS xxxviii. AND NUMBERS I. . . . .	41
VIII. THE NUMBER OF THE PRIESTS AT THE EXODUS COMPARED WITH THEIR DUTIES AND WITH THE PROVISION MADE FOR THEM . . . . .	49
IX. THE PRIESTS AND THEIR DUTIES AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE PASSOVER . . . . .	60



# A FREE ENQUIRY INTO THE DIFFICULTIES SUGGESTED BY DR. COLENZO.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### THE FAMILY OF JUDAH.

1. THE objection which occupies the first place in Dr. Colenso's volume, and to the consideration of which we find two whole chapters devoted, is perhaps in some respects the most important of all. For it goes to prove, not a mere improbability, or even absurdity, but a clear positive contradiction in the Scriptural narrative.

2. The objection is this:—In the 46th chapter of Genesis we find that Hezron and Hamul, the two sons of Pharez, went down into Egypt with Jacob: whereas it can, *aliunde*, be proved to demonstration that they were not then born.

For Judah was three years older than Joseph<sup>a</sup>, and as Joseph was 17 years old when he was sold into Egypt<sup>b</sup>, Judah must then have been 20 years old. After this he marries a wife<sup>c</sup>, and has by her, separately, three sons. Two of these sons are successively married to Tamar. She then deceives Judah himself, and bears to him Pharez and Zarah; and Pharez has two sons, Hezron and Hamul. But Joseph was only 39 years old when Jacob went down into Egypt<sup>d</sup>, therefore Judah was then only 42; and we have a period of no more than twenty-two years

<sup>a</sup> Gen. xxix. 35, xxx. 24—26, xxxi. 41.      <sup>b</sup> Ib. xxxvii. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Ib. xxxviii. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Ib. xli. 46, 47, xlv. 6.

from the marriage of Judah to the birth of Hezron and Hamul. We are therefore obliged to conclude that one of the two accounts must be untrue. (Colenso, 19, 20.)

3. Now I am about to consider this question on the supposition (which is probably correct) that Hezron and Hamul were born in Egypt.

It does not indeed appear to me that Dr. Colenso is justified in stating, as an undeniable fact, that Judah's marriage with the daughter of Shuah took place "after Joseph's being sold into Egypt." (Gen. xxxviii. 1.)

The previous narrative had traced the wanderings and adventures of Jacob until he had returned into the land of promise, watched by his father's death-bed, and been left, by the departure of Esau, in undisturbed enjoyment of his pastoral life.

The writer then goes on to narrate the events which occurred in this period of his life, introducing this section of the story with the general heading,—“And Jacob dwelt in the land wherein his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan.” (Gen. xxxvii. 1.) He then details the adventures of Joseph, bringing them down in this 37th chapter to the period of his sale to Potiphar.

Now had Joseph's history been carried on consecutively, the writer would have found no opportunity for recounting the story of Judah. And accordingly he breaks off here, as at a convenient halt in the narrative, and interposes a whole chapter, (the 38th,) giving us the full story of Judah and his family. Then in the 39th chapter he takes up the thread of Joseph's history exactly where he had dropped it, and carries it on thenceforward without any further interruption.

But it is quite clear that all the events which are detailed in the 38th chapter did not occur in the interval which elapsed between the 37th and the 39th chapters.

And then the question arises, What meaning are we to attach to the introductory words of the 38th chapter, "It came to pass at that time?" Three meanings are possible, (1) that we are reading a consecutive narrative, so that immediately after the events recorded in the 37th chapter, those chronicled in the 38th chapter commence; (2) that the most important of the incidents about to be related took place in the interval between the 37th and 39th chapters; or (3) that the whole occurrence took place at *that time*, that is to say, at that period of Jacob's life of which the writer is speaking—the period, that is, of Jacob's dwelling in the land wherein his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan.

The second is the interpretation adopted by Mr. Hoare, who cites Matthew iii. 1, "In those days came John the Baptist," and other passages where the phrase "in those days" is used merely as an introduction to a new story, and not as a note of time at all.

And without myself attempting to determine which of these three interpretations is to be preferred, I certainly cannot feel justified in concluding with Dr. Colenso that the first is unquestionably the correct one.

Still it may be so; and even if it were not, and if Judah were at the time of going down to Egypt 47, (as many calculate,) instead of 42, (as Dr. Colenso supposes,) I think it most improbable that Hezron and Hamul should have been then born. For though in point of actual relationship they were Judah's grandchildren, yet in point of age they must have been as distant from him as if they had been his great-grandchildren.

I now, therefore, proceed to consider the question on the assumption that Hezron and Hamul were not born until after Jacob went down into Egypt.



4. And here I must lay down a canon of criticism, applicable to the interpretation of every author :—

Where a sentence, a phrase, a word, is fairly susceptible of two interpretations, we must look to the other facts recorded in the narrative to ascertain which of the two interpretations we are in this instance to adopt. Nor does it matter that the interpretation which we shall thus discover to be the correct one, is not that which we should at first sight have been inclined to affix to the passage.

5. I will illustrate this from an instance in Dr. Colenso's own work. In his fifteenth chapter he is arguing that the Israelites were sojourning in Egypt not 400, but only 215, or rather 210 years :—

He is at once met with the statement in Gen. xv. 13, 14, "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years. And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterwards shall they come out with great substance."

On this passage he makes the following just remarks :—

"*At first sight*, indeed, it would seem from the above that Abraham's descendants were to be afflicted for 400 years, in one land, such as Egypt, by one nation. *But it is certain that they were not afflicted, according to the story, during all the time of their sojourn in Egypt. And hence it appears that the time here specified, 400 years, is meant to refer to the time during which the seed of Abraham should be sojourners in a strange land, rather than to the oppression which they were to suffer during some part of that sojourning. . . . We conclude, then, that the 400 years in the above passage are meant to date from the birth of Isaac.*" (Colenso, 106, 107.)

This appears to me to be a fair and legitimate application of the canon of criticism above referred to.

6. I may perhaps be permitted to add one other

example, drawn from the very passage which we are about to consider.

In Genesis xli. 7, we are told that Jacob brought his daughters and his sons' daughters with him into Egypt. But in the list which immediately follows we find the name of one daughter only, and one grand-daughter only.

And Dr. Colenso, who argues that this paucity of women did in fact exist, finds no difficulty in ascribing the use of the plural in the first verse to a Hebrew idiom. (Colenso, 24, note; cf. id. 117.)

And this, although a more doubtful, is probably a just application of the same principle. It has at any rate been generally adopted. St. Augustine, for example, speaking of another instance in which the plural number is used with reference to one individual, says, "Pluraliter appellati sunt sicut Scriptura consuevit: quæ unam quoque filiam Jacob filias nuncupavit." (De Civ. Dei, xvi. 40.)

In this case, the plural "daughters" being brought into immediate juxtaposition with the pedigree, which shews but one daughter, no question could arise as to the existence of any actual contradiction. But if the fact of Dinah being Jacob's only daughter had to be laboriously deduced from a comparison and combination of other parts of the Pentateuch, would Dr. Colenso have allowed this explanation of the plural number to pass? Would he not at once have laid his finger on "the plain meaning of the word?" Might he not fairly have said, *more suo*, "But that in order to support the veracity of Scripture we are obliged to do violence to the plain meaning of the writer, would not every one have believed that the writer who speaks of the daughters of Jacob supposed him to have more than one? Would not every one, looking at this passage alone,

have believed that such was the meaning of the words?"

And the answer is, Every one would have believed so : it is merely by looking to the other recorded facts that we can give a more correct interpretation than that which would at first sight have suggested itself to our minds.

7. Now in applying this canon of criticism to the case before us, the first question is, Is the phrase "coming down into Egypt" fairly susceptible of two interpretations? Can it mean that the persons enumerated were among the number of the immigrants, the aliens, the sojourners in Egypt, or must it of necessity mean that they were themselves among the actual travellers who came down into Egypt?

That the phrase *will* bear both interpretations is obvious from verse 27, where within the compass of one verse Joseph's sons are stated to have come into, and yet to have been born in, Egypt. The two statements being placed in immediate juxtaposition, there is no room for any suggestion of a contradiction here.

So in Deut. x. 22 we read, "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons," although the fact of two at least of those persons having been born in Egypt was too striking and prominent a feature in the narrative to have been unknown to or misunderstood or forgotten by any one.

The phrase being, therefore, fairly susceptible of two interpretations, let us consider which of the two is to be adopted in this place. At first sight we should suppose that in Gen. xlv. 8—26 we had merely a list of the travellers, the actual occupants and escort of the Egyptian wagons. But let us look into the details.

8. The first statement that meets us is an account of

Reuben's family ; " And the sons of Reuben ; Hanoch, and Phallu, and Hezron, and Carmi." (Gen. xlv. 9.)

On this Hengstenberg remarks, that when Jacob's sons wished to take their last journey to Egypt, Reuben had only two sons. " Slay my two sons, if I bring him not to thee." (xlii. 37.)

Dr. Colenso answers this as follows: " Reuben's words were spoken when they had returned from Egypt the first time, not when they were about to go down the second time. (xliii. 2.) A whole year appears to have elapsed, according to the story, between the first journey and the second, (xlv. 6) ; and, after that, some time elapsed before Jacob went down to Egypt. At all events, the interval between the time of Reuben's speech and that of Jacob's migration was quite long enough for two more sons to have been born to Reuben in the land of Canaan." (Colenso, 27.)

*Reply.* This is quite in Dr. Colenso's style. Gen. xlv. 6 *has no reference whatever to the interval which elapsed between the first journey and the second.* It merely states that on the second journey into Egypt the famine had been for two years in the land. This, of course, proves nothing as to the interval between the two journeys, unless we have some reason for supposing that the period which elapsed before the sons of Jacob went down into Egypt for their first supply of provisions was only equal in duration to that which again elapsed before they went down for their second. Let us therefore consider the probabilities of the case.

(1.) We are told that, some years before, " Jacob increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maidservants, and men-servants, and camels, and asses," (Gen. xxx. 43) ; and as the Divine blessing had never forsaken him, there is certainly no reason to suppose that he was not at least as wealthy and prosperous a man when the years of famine commenced. Is it conceivable, then, that the famine should have found him so needy and unprovided, that all his accumulated stores should support him for the same period only for which the ten<sup>e</sup> sacks (Gen.

\* Or 'nine,' if Simeon's was not carried back. I do not understand on what calculation Dr. Colenso arrives at the conclusion that there were eleven sacks. (Colenso, 134.)

xlii. 25, 27) afterwards supported him? Add to this that a famine cannot set in in a day; the effects of the blazing sun, of the continued drought, may be rapid, but cannot be instantaneous; the failure of the earth's produce in the first year would be partial only, compared to what it would be in the second, when the famine had settled down in its full severity and intensity.

(2.) But, in fact, could the ten sacks of corn have by any possibility been sufficient to support for a whole year Jacob himself, and his sons, and his sons' sons, and his menservants, and maid-servants, and all that he had? We see from Gen. xlii. 27 that the very provender for the asses was taken from these sacks.

(3.) And if ten asses could carry a whole year's supply, how inconceivable it would be that Joseph should have sent double that amount for the special maintenance of his father during his journey into Egypt. (Gen. xlv. 23.) It was right and fitting that the great minister should be liberal, and even magnificent, in the reception of his relatives, but to send for their wants during a few weeks a supply sufficient for two whole years, would surely have been mere needless extravagance in a time of dearth.

(4.) But, indeed, is it probable that Joseph, in whose heart the sight of his ten brethren in the crowd had kindled so eager and tender a longing to see the old man, his father, and his brother Benjamin once again, would have let his brethren depart without making himself in any way known to them, if he was aware that they would not be coming again for the space of a whole year?

(5.) Or is it probable that Simeon should have been quietly left in prison for so long a time?

(6.) And the very urgency and emphasis of Reuben's appeal, "Slay my two sons," would seem wholly out of place, if uttered a year before the existence of any necessity for a return into Egypt. There is no reason to suppose that Reuben knew, though Joseph did, that the famine was to last seven years; and he would probably have imagined that a year's provisions would have amply sufficed to tide them through the famine until once again the Lord should send a gracious rain upon His inheritance, the pastures be clothed with flocks, and the valleys

covered over with corn. His urgent entreaty reads rather as if they were, or ought to have been, almost on the point of starting.

Other slighter circumstances might be mentioned, all leading to the same conclusion. I can discover no counter probability whatever. The whole narrative seems to be in perfect harmony; and every circumstance tends to shew that the interval between the two journeys was, according to the story, not a whole year, but at the most a period of two or three months.

Still if it were only a week, it is no doubt not impossible that the two additional children may have been born within that week. I therefore only ask the reader to bear this case in mind, as one where it is *probable*, though not certain, that two of the persons enumerated were not born at the time of the journey to Egypt.

9. The twelfth verse gives us a list of the family of Judah.

“And the sons of Judah; Er, Onan,”—

What, are these the children of Israel who accompanied the Egyptian wagons? Are Er and Onan, who (as we are told in the next sentence) were long since dead, included in a list of the actual travellers? Clearly not. Clearly this instance is of itself sufficient to shew that, even if the writer started with the intention of merely giving us a list of the actual travellers, he has to some extent abandoned that intention, he is to some extent and for some purposes supplying a general pedigree of the Israelites irrespective of the actual occupancy of the Egyptian wagons.

And in the latter part of the same verse we find, “And the sons of Pharez<sup>r</sup> were Hezron and Hamul,” who *ex concessis* were born in Egypt.

10. Travelling down the names, we come, in the very heart of the list, to the following verse:—

“And unto Joseph in the land of Egypt were born

“This is the only place in the list where the presence of a verb constitutes a distinct sentence. Dr. Colenso in quoting the verse omits the verb.

Manasseh and Ephraim, which Asenath, the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On, bare unto him." (Gen. xvi. 20.)

We might expect to find (as we do in fact find ver. 27) a separate mention of the children of Joseph, but the insertion of their names in the heart of the list is surely of itself sufficient to shew that whatever this list of names may be, it certainly is not, and could not have been intended to be, a list of the actual travellers.

11. And the next verse is, "And the sons of Benjamin; Belah, and Becher, and Ashbel, Gera, and *Naaman*, Ehi, and Rosh, Müppim, and Huppim, and *Ard*."

Hengstenberg remarks upon this that the representation of Benjamin as a youth is so fixed and constant, that it could not enter into the thoughts of an Israelite that on his going down into Egypt he had ten sons. In xliii. 8, xliv. 30, 31, 33, he is called a "lad;" in xliv. 20, "a little one;" and in xliii. 29, Joseph calls him his son.

To which Dr. Colenso rejoins: "Benjamin, though called a youth, was more than 22 years old, according to the story, at the time of Jacob's migration; it is therefore quite possible that he may have had ten sons,—perhaps by several wives." (Colenso, 27.)

Polygamy may therefore be assumed for the purpose of discrediting the writer's statements, although when suggested in their defence Dr. Colenso puts the suggestion aside, with the remark that "there is no reason to believe that polygamy *did* prevail at that time among the Hebrews." (Colenso, 96 and 144.)

But what shall we say when we find that two at least of the ten (though here spoken of in the ordinary Scripture phraseology as sons of Benjamin) were in strict accuracy not sons but grandsons?

We read in Numbers xxvi. 38—40, "The sons of Benjamin after their families: of Bela, the family of the Belaites: . . . and the sons of Bela were *Ard* and *Naaman*."

I can only express my surprise that this fact should have

escaped the microscopic glance of Dr. Colenso, turned so frequently and so closely upon this very chapter.

Now even supposing that the description of "a little one," "a lad," is applicable to the father of ten children, could it in any sense be applied to a grandfather? Is it, in fact, possible that these grandchildren should have been then born? We know that Benjamin was not 33 years old, for Joseph was but 39, and Benjamin was certainly six years younger, (Gen. xxx. 25, xxxi. 41, xxxv. 18, xli. 46, 53, xlv. 6); and all that can be said is that he was more than 22. If he *was* then a grandfather, Hezron and Hamul may have been born in Canaan: if he was not a grandfather, Ard and Naaman must have been born in Egypt.

To me, I confess, the language used with regard to Benjamin seems hardly consistent with the notion of his being even a married man at the time of the migration, but Dr. Colenso thinks otherwise, and it is not a question which admits of argument.

12. Kurtz refers also to the 5th verse of the chapter, where it is said that "the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father, and their little ones, and their wives, in the wagons," which, though it certainly does not prove that all their children were young, yet undoubtedly harmonizes rather with that view than with the supposition that some of these very children were themselves the fathers of families.

13. Looking, then, at all these instances gleaned even from the scanty records of 3,000 years ago, it seems clear that we are intended to give to the expression "which came into Egypt" the signification which we find it bears in other passages. It seems clear that this is not a mere list of the actual travellers, but that the writer is to some extent and for some purposes giving a general pedigree of the immigrants, irrespective of their personal participation in the immigration itself.

14. Still there is a question which Dr. Colenso repeatedly puts, and which undoubtedly deserves an answer:—



“How is it that Hezron and Hamul, the two sons of Pharez, are mentioned, and the sons of Zarah are not mentioned?” (Colenso, 25.)

“Why are not the children named of all Jacob’s grandchildren as well as those of Pharez and Beriah?” (Colenso, 27.)

“Why has the writer mentioned grandchildren only of Judah and Asher, and not of the other sons of Jacob?” (Colenso, 28.)

Or in other words, To what extent and for what purposes has the writer given the pedigree of the Israelites in the 46th chapter of Genesis?

15. To all these questions the 26th chapter of Numbers appears to afford a direct and conclusive answer. In this chapter the sum of all Israel is taken in the plains of Moab according to their families; and the families of Reuben, Judah, Benjamin, and Asher are found to be as follows:—

“Reuben, the eldest son of Israel: the children of Reuben; Hanoch, of whom cometh the family of the Hanochites: of Pallu, the family of the Palluites: of Hezron, the family of the Hezronites: of Carmi, the family of the Carmites. These are the families of the Reubenites.” (vers. 5—7.) The writer then goes on to mention the sons of Pallu, but there are no more Reubenite *families*.

“The sons of Judah were Er and Onan: and Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan. And the sons of Judah after their families were; of Shelah, the family of the Shelanites; of Pharez, the family of the Pharezites; of Zarah, the family of the Zarhites. And the sons of Pharez were; of Hezron, the family of the Hezronites: of Hamul, the family of the Hamulites. These are the families of Judah.” (vers. 19—22.) And now perhaps we can begin to see why Hezron and Hamul, the sons of Pharez, were mentioned, while the sons of Zarah were not mentioned.

“The sons of Benjamin after their families: of Bela, the family of the Belaites: of Ashbel, the family of the Ashbelites: of Ahiram,

the family of the Ahiramites: of Shupham, the family of the Shuphamites: of Hupham, the family of the Huphamites. And the sons of Bela were Ard and Naaman: of Ard, the family of the Ardites: and of Naaman, the family of the Naamites. These are the sons of Benjamin after their families." (vers. 38—41.)

"Of the children of Asher after their families: of Jimna, the family of the Jimnites: of Jesui, the family of the Jesuites: of Beriah, the family of the Beriites. Of the sons of Beriah: of Heber, the family of the Heberites: of Malchiel, the family of the Malchielites. And the name of the daughter of Asher was Sarah. These are the families of the sons of Asher." (vers. 44—47.) We see here why the writer in Gen. xlv. mentioned grandchildren of Asher.

16. We learn from this chapter that the Israelites were ranged into a number of families, (the Septuagint calls them *δῆμοι*,) distinguished by the names of their respective ancestors. We see, too, that the ancestor eponymus was sometimes a grandson, sometimes a great-grandson, of Jacob. And it would, of course, be a matter of great interest and importance to each family that the ancestor whose name it bore, and from whom it claimed to be descended, should be shewn to be one of the pure Israelites, one of the immigrants into the land of Egypt, and not an Egyptian, a stranger to the Promise. But whether he himself came down in person to Egypt, or was born of parents who had done so, would of course be a matter of comparative indifference.

Accordingly, in the concise pedigree which the historian prefixes to his account of the immigration, we find that in order to shew that all these eponymi were pure Israelites, of the seed of Abraham, he goes into the genealogy at sufficient length to include all their names, descending even to the great-grandchildren wherever it is necessary for that purpose, but not otherwise.

That this was really his intention is, I think, pretty

clear from another pedigree which occurs a few chapters later : "The sons of Reuben; Hanoah, and Pallu, Hezron, and Carmi : these be the *families* of Reuben." (Exod. vi. 14.)

The only cases in which he departs from this plan in the pedigree of Gen. xlv. are the families of Joseph and Levi. And in each case the reason for his doing so is, I think, sufficiently apparent.

17. From the date of this journey to Egypt, Joseph becomes the principal figure in the narrative : his history and that of his children stand thenceforward in the foreground of the Book of Genesis ; the other sons of Jacob appear only as "Joseph's brethren." We hear nothing more of them as individuals, of their lives, of their deaths, of their families.

It was fitting, then, that in dismissing them from our notice the historian should take that opportunity of sketching the outline of their families ; while there was no need for, nor in fact would there have been any propriety in, such a course in the case of Joseph. In his case there was no need to depart from the strict chronological order ; his history was to be continued. The writer, therefore, need say nothing, and does say nothing, of Joseph's family until he comes to record his death : we then find, as we might expect, a brief compendious statement. (Gen. l. 23.) The names are not fully enumerated ; indeed, Joseph's exalted position must have rendered them sufficiently notorious.

18. The pedigree of the house of Levi was, on a different ground, also reserved for a supplementary statement. In the early chapters of the succeeding Book, it would be desirable to give a full and exact account of the pedigree of the great leaders of the Exodus, Moses and Aaron. This involved the genealogy of the children

of Levi, with their families, which is here therefore duly supplied. (Exod. vi. 16—25.)

With these two exceptions, there is not (so far as appears from our text of the Pentateuch) one great-grandchild mentioned in the pedigree of Gen. xlv. who was not the eponymus of a family; nor one omitted who was the eponymus of a family.

19. A few names indeed (Er and Onan for instance) are inserted in this pedigree which do not re-appear as the names of eponymi of the great Israelite families—the writer apparently giving a complete pedigree of each house, until he reaches the names of which he is in quest.

That this was his method of stating a pedigree, we see from the remarkable instance contained in the 6th chapter of Exodus. In the 13th verse, the Lord is represented as giving Moses and Aaron “a charge to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt.” The writer considers this a favourable opportunity for shewing exactly who these Moses and Aaron were; and he accordingly sets out their genealogy, and winds it up by saying, not perhaps without a slight touch of natural self-complacency, “These are that Moses and Aaron, to whom the Lord said, Bring out the children of Israel from the land of Egypt according to their armies. These are they which spake to Pharaoh king of Egypt, to bring out the children of Israel from Egypt: these are that Moses and Aaron.” (26, 27.) The whole scope and purpose of the genealogy was to shew us who these Moses and Aaron were; and yet what sort of genealogy has he set out? Not merely that of the tribe of Levi to which they belonged. No; Levi was but the third son of Jacob: Reuben and Simeon were his elder brothers. He therefore goes through Reuben’s pedigree, then Simeon’s, then Levi’s, until he has arrived at the names he is looking for; and then he goes no further.

20. It does not, I think, appear with certainty whether the families of which we are speaking comprised all the children of Israel, or whether they were merely the great

leading families of the nation, the princes of the people of Israel. Some expressions to be found in the 6th chapter of Exodus seem to favour this latter view: "These be the heads of their fathers' houses." (ver. 14.) "These are the heads of the fathers of the Levites according to their families." (ver. 25.) And we find elsewhere in the Pentateuch the names of other families which (possibly as being less distinguished) are not included in the list of Numbers xxvi.

21. The writers of the Septuagint have made some alterations in the pedigree of Gen. xlii. But so far are they from endeavouring to reduce it to a mere list of the actual travellers, (although they have retained the ambiguous phrase, τῶν εἰσελθόντων εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἅμα Ἰακώβ,) that they have inserted the names of several additional persons who, beyond all controversy, were born in Egypt. In *their* pedigree Ard is not a grandson, but a great-grandson, of Benjamin. And the names of the sons and grandsons of Ephraim and Manasseh are added, so as to make the list of eponymi fuller and more complete.

22. So clearly and unmistakeably have they made this a pedigree of the immigrants rather than a list of the travellers, that a chapter by St. Augustine on the subject is with reason entitled "Quomodo Jacob cum septuaginta quinque animabus Ægyptum narretur ingressus, cum PLERIQUE ex iis qui commemorantur tempore posteriore sint geniti:" "In what sense Jacob is said to have gone down into Egypt with seventy-five persons when MOST OF THEM were born after that date." And he observes: "Res *diligenter considerata* non indicat quod tantus numerus fuerit in progenie Jacob, die vel anno quo ingressus est Ægyptum." And again: "Illud est quod fallit *minus ista diligenter intuentes*, quoniam

scriptum est, 'Hæc autem nomina filiorum Israel qui intraverunt in Ægyptum simul cum Jacob patre suo.' Hoc enim dictum est quia simul cum illo computantur septuaginta quinque, non quia simul jam erant omnes quando Ægyptum ingressus est ipse." (De Civ. Dei, xvi. 40.)

23. I am not citing either the Septuagint or St. Augustine as an authority for the truth of the explanation, but merely to shew that it has obtained (not with any reference to the case of Hezron and Hamul, but on totally distinct considerations) with the most eminent doctors of the Jewish and Christian Churches. And with these opinions before him, it seems surprising that Dr. Colenso should venture at the very outset of his volume to assume without argument that the opposite theory must be accepted by all as an unquestioned and unquestionable fact.

His very first words, after citing Gen. xlv. 12, are,—

"It appears to me to be certain that the writer here means to say that Hezron and Hamul were born in the land of Canaan, and were among the seventy persons (including Jacob himself, and Joseph and his two sons) who came into Egypt with Jacob." (Colenso, 19.)

And shortly afterwards, in the same paragraph :—

"I assume that it is absolutely undeniable that the narrative of the Exodus distinctly involves the statement, that the sixty-six persons out of the loins of Jacob mentioned in Gen. xlv., and no others, went down with him into Egypt."

These are strange assumptions for the commencement of a "critical examination." But we shall meet with stranger ones by and bye.

## CHAPTER II.

THE CONGREGATION AND THE COURT OF THE  
TABERNACLE.

24. "AND the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Moses did as the Lord commanded him; and the assembly was gathered together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." (Lev. viii. 1—4.)

"As the text says distinctly 'at the door of the tabernacle,' they must," argues Dr. Colenso, "have come within the court. And this indeed was necessary for the purpose for which they were summoned on this occasion, namely, to witness the ceremony of the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priestly office. This was to be performed inside the tabernacle itself, and could only therefore be seen by those standing at the door." (Colenso, 35.)

And as the congregation may probably have consisted of two million persons, and the little court of the tabernacle could barely accommodate five thousand, though densely packed behind, before, and on either side of the tabernacle, and only 504 of these would be in front of the tabernacle itself, and only nine strictly at its door, Dr. Colenso not unnaturally concludes that "it is inconceivable how under such circumstances 'all the assembly,' 'the whole congregation,' could have been summoned to attend 'at the door of the tabernacle,' by the express command of Almighty God." (Colenso, 38.)

25. We see that this objection wholly or mainly depends for its force and validity on Dr. Colenso's

positive assumption that the ceremony which these assembled multitudes were invited to witness, was to be performed inside the tabernacle itself. Let us turn to the 8th chapter of Leviticus, and consider how far this assumption is justified by the facts of the case.

(1.) The first part of the ceremonial consisted in washing Aaron and his sons with water. (ver. 6.) Compare also Exodus xl. 11, 12, where we have a compendious account of the same transaction.

But the laver was in the open court between the tabernacle and the altar of burnt-offering. (Exodus xxx. 18, xl. 7, 30.)

The reader will understand the proceedings more distinctly if he will keep before him a plan of the tabernacle and its appurtenances. Such a plan is to be found in every illustrated Bible or Scripture history.

(2.) Immediately on the conclusion of the washing, they were to be clothed in the priestly garments. (vers. 7—9.) This must needs have taken place on the same spot.

(3.) Then Moses anointed the tabernacle and all that was therein. (ver. 10.) If by this we are to understand a separate anointing for what was within the tabernacle, Moses must of course have gone in for that purpose, but he almost immediately returns,

(4.) And anoints the altar of burnt-offering (compare Exodus xl. 10) and the laver, (ver. 11,) both of which were in the open court.

(5.) He then anoints Aaron, who seems to have remained throughout by the laver and altar. And dresses Aaron's sons.

(6.) And then follow three sacrifices; a bullock for a sin-offering, (vers. 14—16,) a ram for a burnt-offering, (vers. 18—21,) and the ram of consecration. (vers. 22—29.) All these were offered on the altar in the open court.

(7.) And finally, Moses sprinkled upon Aaron and his sons the anointing oil and the blood of the sacrifices. (ver. 30.) And so the first day's ceremony ended.

But on the eighth day, after the vigil of initiation was concluded, the congregation is once more summoned. Aaron, now



the consecrated High-Priest, comes forth before all the people, and on the altar in the open court he offers the sin-offering, the burnt-offering, the peace-offerings. (Lev. ix. 8—22.)

“And Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out, and blessed the people: and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people. And there came a fire out from the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces.” (Lev. ix. 23, 24.)

26. Now can anything be plainer than all this? Is it not abundantly obvious that (with one insignificant exception) the whole of the ceremonial took place under the open sky? nay, that the court must of necessity have been kept clear and vacant during its performance? Is there the slightest shadow of a justification for Dr. Colenso's positive assumption that “the ceremony was to be performed inside the tabernacle itself?” The historian does not even leave us in the dark on the subject; he expressly shews that everything was to be performed out of doors.

The scene is brought vividly enough before our eyes. We can see the tabernacle, erected probably on a gentle incline; the priests moving backwards and forwards in the foreground; the flames of the altar dimmed by the brightness of an Eastern sun; the cloud of glory, the visible symbol of the Divine Presence, resting over the sanctuary; and in front, on the plain, the hills, the mountains, the many thousands of Israel watching the first sacrifices of the Law offered to Almighty God. There can be no difficulty in point of space—the wilderness was behind them.

Of course we cannot suppose that every man, woman, and child was there, although there would be room enough for all. Many would be scattered far and wide

with their flocks and herds, some detained by sickness, others by a variety of domestic duties. These of course would not be expected to be present. But with these exceptions there seems no difficulty in supposing that the whole nation was summoned to attend. "Gather all the congregation;" exclude no one; summon not the Levites only, not the elders only, not the officers only, give a general summons, call a general, a national meeting. The distinction between a national assembly, and the assembly of some privileged classes or castes, is familiar to every student of antiquity.

27. With respect to the phrase, "unto the door," I at first thought that it might be desirable to point out other passages in the Pentateuch where the same or a similar expression is found under circumstances which positively forbid the idea of any actual contact with the door-posts being intended, and where, therefore, the phrase must of necessity mean merely "in front" of the tabernacle. But in truth, is it possible to conceive a stronger instance of the kind than the one before us? Even if the writer did not know, or had forgotten, that he was dealing with two millions of people, he could not at any rate have overlooked the fact, which is over and over again reiterated, that there were 600,000 adult males. He represents them all as summoned to witness an imposing ceremony, a ceremony which took place not in the tabernacle itself, but in the open air, and which must have required that a large open space should be left vacant for its performance. Could he have supposed it possible that any one would so misunderstand his language as to imagine that he meant to represent them as tightly packed into this little court, which could not, even so, have held the tenth part of the smallest of their tribes? Is not this instance alone sufficient to shew that by

the phrase, "unto the door of the tabernacle," we are to understand "in front of the tabernacle," and not an actual approximation to the door-posts? And would not that in fact be the natural meaning of the words? If a speaker were to say that a crowd of 30,000 men was assembled at the door of St. Paul's, would any one understand him to mean that they were packed within the little railing which environs it? And if a listener were to reply, "Your statement must be incorrect: if they were, as you say, at the door of St. Paul's, they must have been within the railings; I have myself measured the space, and find that only 504 men could stand there, and indeed only nine really and strictly at the door,"—would not every one treat such an argument rather as a joke than as a serious attempt to impugn the veracity of the speaker? Nor (I am convinced) would Dr. Colenso have adopted an argument of this kind had he not been misled by his own unfortunate assumption that the ceremony was to take place within the tabernacle itself, and so could only be witnessed by those who were standing on its threshold.

Dr. Colenso speaks of the door of the tabernacle as distinct from the front of the tabernacle; but it must be remembered that there was no actual door, the front *was* the door.

In this particular instance, therefore, the historian himself supplies every requisite detail, and it can from his own words be conclusively shewn that the objection is based on an oversight. But even were it otherwise, even if we had not the means of proving the existence of certain facts necessary for the truth of the narrative, would it have been fair to assume their non-existence? I think that in all fairness the presumption should be the other way. I think that when we consider the an-

tiquity and brevity of the narrative, and remember how much there must be which we cannot possibly have been told, we should pause before we venture<sup>s</sup> on such grounds as these to impugn the veracity of the historian.

<sup>s</sup> The danger of an affectation of minute and exceeding accuracy, when we are not perfectly acquainted with every detail, is happily illustrated by Mr. Disraeli in the first chapter of "Coningsby:"—

"But Mr. Rigby was sceptical. He declared that Paul Evelyn was always wrong; that if Lord Grey had been at the palace to-day, he could not have been there before twelve o'clock; that it was only now one quarter to one; that Lord Grey would have called his colleagues together on his return; that at least an hour must have elapsed before anything could possibly have transpired. Then he compared and criticised the dates of every rumoured incident during the last twenty-four hours, (and nobody was stronger in dates than Mr. Rigby): *counted even the number of stairs which the minister had to ascend and descend in his visit to the palace, and the time their mounting and dismounting must have absorbed*, (detail was Mr. Rigby's forte); and finally, what with his dates, his private information, his knowledge of palace localities, his contempt for Paul Evelyn, and his confidence in himself, he succeeded in persuading his downcast and disheartened friends that their comfortable intelligence had not the slightest foundation.

Presently a young nobleman enters the hall. "'You know, of course, that Lord Lyndhurst is with the King,' said the Duke.

"'It is impossible,' said Mr. Rigby.

"'I don't think I can be mistaken,' said the Duke, smiling.

"'I will shew your Grace that it is impossible,' said Mr. Rigby. 'Lord Lyndhurst slept at Wimbledon. Lord Grey could not have seen the King until twelve o'clock; it is now five minutes to one. It is impossible therefore that any message from the King could have reached Lord Lyndhurst in time for his Lordship to be at the palace at this moment.'

"'But my authority is a high one,' said the Duke.

"'Authority is a phrase,' said Mr. Rigby; 'we must look to time and place, dates and localities, to discover truth.'

"'My authority is the highest,' said the Duke, 'for it was Lord Lyndhurst himself.'"

Mr. Rigby appears to have been the founder of our present

28. And surely where a phrase is susceptible of a rational interpretation, and also of another interpretation which would give an impossible, an absurd, an extravagant meaning to the passage wherein it occurs, it is not unfair to conclude that the latter is not the interpretation which the author intended us to adopt.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### MOSES ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL.

29. THERE is perhaps no more sublime and pathetic address in all literature than that which we call the Book of Deuteronomy. It is the solemn farewell of the great Lawgiver to his people on the borders of the promised land. Few men have ever been able to look back on so strange and varied an experience. Brought up in the halls of Egyptian luxury, an eager student of Egyptian science, he had retired in the prime of his manhood to lead a shepherd's life in the wilderness. Thence he had returned to the palaces of his youth, there to confront the mightiest monarch in the world, to become the champion of an oppressed and degraded nation, and in spite of the fierce anger of the King and the uncompromising resistance of all that warlike race, to bring

school of Remorseless Critics; but his successors, wiser than he, or warned by his example, have in general confined their remorseless efforts to points where, from the very nature of the case, they can but seldom encounter so instantaneous, conclusive, and overwhelming a refutation. Yet without some such sharp and decisive evidence it would have been impossible wholly to silence Mr. Rigby. A defence founded on a suggestion that something may have happened, we know not what, although obviously reasonable, yet always seems lame and halting, and rarely receives the attention to which it is really entitled.

out from among them the sons of Jacob by a great, un-hoped deliverance. For one-and-forty years he had been with them in the wilderness, their guide, their leader, and their friend; unfolding, digesting, maturing that strange system of polity which was to make them, as it has through all ages made them, a separate and peculiar people. All was over now; the toils, the wanderings, the trials, the weariness, the anxieties, the cares. The Hebrew mind had been drilled and disciplined enough. The promise, long-expected, had at last arrived; the land of Canaan lay open at their feet. And now they must part for ever; he to die alone, they, with the joy and clang of victory, to take possession of the promised land.

“But I must die in this land, I must not go over Jordan: but ye shall go over, and possess that good land.” (Deut. iv. 22.)

Yet ere he ascend the mountain-top to meet death, or we know not what mysterious doom, he has one more task to accomplish. Soon will the land of settlement be won; soon must these strange and novel laws be brought into full operation; and so, ere his voice be hushed for ever, he will once more recapitulate to his people the wondrous things which God had done for them, and endeavour for the last time to impress upon their minds the lines and figures of their future system.

He refers to the original delivery of the law (now known as the Book of Leviticus) which had been made to their fathers forty years before. Then, as now, they were about to move upon the land of Canaan; then, as now, the law seemed about to be put into immediate operation, but then their own disobedience had postponed and suspended the promise. And now at this awful moment—awful to him, for death is awful to all, awful

to them, for they were about to lose their captain, their counsellor, their father—he would fain deepen and strengthen the half-forgotten precepts by another and a final republication of them.

“Behold, *I have taught you statutes and judgments*, even as the Lord my God commanded me, *that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it*. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day? . . . For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it? Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live? Or hath God assayed to go and take Him a nation from the midst of another nation, by temptations, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm, and by great terrors, according to all that the Lord your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? . . . Thou shalt keep therefore His statutes, and His commandments, which I command thee this day.” (Deut. iv. 5—8, 32—34, 40.)

It is this recapitulation, this solemn leave-taking, which we call the Book of Deuteronomy. Nothing can be more touching, nothing simpler or more in character, than the narrative.

30. But, we are told, it is altogether contradictory and impossible; for how could Moses speak unto all Israel? The Israelites were seemingly two millions in number, and would have made a body of people nearly

twenty miles long and six yards wide, and how could a single voice reach them all?

Was it not natural, then, that the last act of the great lawgiver should be a public address, a public farewell, to a national assembly? And if it were so, how should it be recorded in history except as an address to all Israel? Is not this the universal practice of every historian? Are not speakers, when addressing an assembly from which none were excluded, invariably represented as addressing the whole nation? Do we ever find such a speech restricted, in terms, to those who were present, to those who could hear? Is not the restriction always left to be supplied by the reader from the necessity of the case? Is not the audience always spoken of as the Athenians, the Lacedæmonians, the Roman people, as the case may be? Nay, is Schömann, when he distinguishes the Athenian general assemblies from their other meetings, by asserting that in the former case the *whole of the* people met, in the latter portions only of them<sup>h</sup>, stating anything in contradiction to Böckh, who observes that "all the citizens, even on the most important affairs, never attended the assembly?" (Publ. Econ., i. 7.) Does not the common sense of every reader supply the necessary limitation?

31. And is there any reason to suppose that the Hebrew usage differed from that of other authors? Innumerable instances might be adduced to prove the contrary. I will merely cite one or two taken at random from the Books of Samuel and the Kings. The writers of those Books were very familiar with the population and extent of the kingdom, and well aware that not one hundredth part of the people could ever have been gathered together at one time in one place to be ad-

<sup>h</sup> De Com., i. 1. :



dressed by one voice; yet they never hesitate to apply to the great national meetings which took place from time to time this very phrase of "all Israel." Samuel, even in his old age, speaks to all Israel<sup>1</sup>, and all the people answer him<sup>1</sup>. All the men of Israel assembled themselves unto King Solomon<sup>k</sup>, and Solomon stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of all the congregation of Israel<sup>1</sup>, and blessed all the congregation of Israel<sup>m</sup>. And the King, and all Israel with him, offered sacrifices before the Lord<sup>n</sup>. So at the time of the great schism Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam<sup>o</sup>, and the King answered them roughly<sup>p</sup>; and when all Israel saw that the King hearkened not unto them, the people answered the King, saying, What portion have we in David<sup>q</sup>? So Elijah, when entering upon his solemn contest with the prophets of Baal, summons all Israel<sup>r</sup>, and speaks unto all the people<sup>s</sup>. And when King Josiah went up into the house of the Lord, all the men of Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem went with him, and the priests and the prophets, and all the people both small and great; and he read in their ears all the words of the Book of the Covenant<sup>t</sup>.

Surely these examples, and they might be multiplied to almost any extent, are sufficient to prove that it was habitual with the Hebrew writers to employ the phrase "all Israel," or an equivalent expression to denote any great national assembly.

32. And Dr. Colenso seems not to deny that this interpretation is a fair one; but he asserts that, even so, we should be impeaching the literal accuracy of the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Sam. xii. 1: cf. vii. 3.      <sup>j</sup> Ib. xii. 19.      <sup>k</sup> 1 Kings viii. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Ib. 22.      <sup>m</sup> Ib. 14, 55.      <sup>n</sup> Ib. 62.      <sup>o</sup> Ib. xii. 12.      <sup>p</sup> Ib. 13.

<sup>q</sup> Ib. 16.      <sup>r</sup> Ib. xviii. 19.      <sup>s</sup> Ib. 21.      <sup>t</sup> 2 Kings xxiii. 2.

Scripture narrative which by some is so strenuously maintained. (Colenso, 42.) I cannot help thinking that this statement is based on a misunderstanding. There is an accuracy of *meaning* entirely independent of accuracy in *words*, and it is frequently necessary to be inaccurate in words in order to convey a perfectly accurate meaning. Theories of inspiration have no doubt been advanced far beyond anything which either Scripture or reason would warrant our believing, but none so wild and fanciful as to forbid our adopting the ordinary rules of *construction* in order to ascertain the real meaning of a passage. Such a theory would ignore the existence in Scripture of all figures and forms of speech: would compel us to adopt mere carnal views of the Divine Nature; to accept the parables as positive statements of fact; to believe that one Psalmist actually stuck fast in the deep mire so that the flood ran over him, and another had his soul, really and literally, always in his hand. It was the perverseness of the Jews that they persisted in thus understanding, or rather misunderstanding, the Saviour's words; in believing that He proposed to give them His visible Body to eat, His visible Blood to drink; that He would in three days restore the very fabric which their ancestors occupied forty and six years in building. The strictest and most exacting theory of inspiration does not reach so far as this, or forbid us to ascertain the writer's meaning by the ordinary rules of construction; it only asks that when his meaning is once so ascertained, it should be accepted as on every subject and for every purpose absolutely and supremely true.

33. If therefore the writer had indubitably intended to represent Moses as speaking to all Israel, the idea would have been natural and rational enough, and the

language in strict accordance with the usage of all writers, sacred and profane. But is it quite clear that he intended to do so? There are certainly some indications which might lead us to suppose the contrary.

(1.) In Deut. xxvii. 1, it is said that "Moses with the elders of Israel commanded the people, saying, Keep all the commandments which I command you this day." *Καὶ προσέταξε Μωυσῆς καὶ ἡ γερουσία Ἰσραὴλ λέγων Φυλάσσετε πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς ταύτας ὅσας ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον.* The concluding words would lead us to believe, what indeed the whole tenor of the narrative seems to imply, that these words were spoken on the same day with the preceding chapters which "Moses said unto all Israel."

And in vers. 9, 10 we read, "And Moses and the priests the Levites spake unto all Israel, saying, Take heed, and hearken, O Israel; this day thou art become the people of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt therefore obey the voice of the Lord thy God, and do His commandments and His statutes, which I command thee this day."

And in the next verse we are told, "And Moses charged the people the same day, saying." (v. 11.)

Now it hardly seems probable that on the same day Moses first spake alone to the whole assembly, then called in the assistance of the elders, of the priests the Levites, and then again resumed his sole discourse.

And if not, it is plain that the words "Moses spake unto all Israel" do not imply that his was the single voice employed.

We see from both the foregoing instances, that the fact of the statements being in the first person singular, "I command thee this day," is no proof that the speaker was Moses alone.

(2.) Still, it may be said, that though improbable, it is not inconceivable, that parts of the same address should have been delivered by Moses alone, and other parts by Moses in conjunction with others; and that we find no instance where it is stated with respect to one and the same discourse, (1) that Moses spake it himself, and (2) that others assisted him.

We do, however, find one such instance, and that precisely in the case where, if anywhere, we should have expected that the

voice of Moses alone would have been employed; viz. in the song of praise which he made and spake almost immediately before his death. The song is ushered in, and concluded, by a description of the manner in which it was delivered.

In Deut. xxxi. 30, we are told that "Moses spake in the ears of all the congregation of Israel the words of this song, until they were ended;" while in Deut. xxxii. 44, we read of the same event that "Moses came and spake all the words of this song in the ears of the people, he, and *Hoshea the son of Nun.*"

(3.) And this view may derive some support and illustration from the fact that all these compositions were in writing. We are expressly told in Deut. xxxi. 9, that "Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi, and unto all the elders of Israel;" and see vv. 22, 24, &c. And that it was written before it was delivered, is evident from the many passages in the address itself, wherein it describes itself as a "book." See xxviii. 58, xxix. 20, 21, xxx. 10, &c.

(4.) And finally, in Deut. xxxi. 28, we find Moses saying, "Gather unto me all the elders of your tribes, and your officers, that I may speak these words in their ears." But if he was at that moment concluding the recitation of them to all Israel, he would hardly require to deliver a second address to the elders and officers, who, it is natural to suppose, would have been not only present at the first, but in the most convenient situations for hearing it. It seems not improbable that this address to the elders and the officers was, in fact, the only address delivered by Moses, and that he thereupon gave them the volume which they, as his ministers, read to the people. There are certainly several passages in the Bible where the assembly of the elders and officers are addressed as all the people.

Perhaps none of these considerations are very convincing; but the whole question, though interesting, is in no way material.

## CHAPTER IV.

## JOSHUA ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL.

34. **ALTHOUGH** Dr. Colenso is willing, if pressed, to allow the accuracy of the foregoing criticism with regard to the case of Moses addressing all Israel, he refuses to make a similar admission with regard to the case of Joshua; and I have, therefore, reserved this objection for a separate consideration.

But before we proceed to the actual transaction recorded in the Book of Joshua, it will be well to cite the previous ordinance in obedience to which that transaction took place.

35. In Deut. xxvii. 11—14, we read:—

“And Moses charged the people the same day, saying, These shall stand upon Mount Gerizim to bless the people, when ye are come over Jordan; Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Joseph, and Benjamin: and these shall stand upon Mount Ebal to curse; Reuben, Gad, and Asher, and Zebulun, Dan, and Naphtali. And the Levites shall speak, and say unto all the men of Israel with a loud voice, saying.” And then follow the well-known catalogues of blessings and cursings.

Accordingly, when the people were come over Jordan, we are told:—

“And all Israel, and their elders, and officers, and judges, stood on this side the ark and on that side before the priests the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, as well the stranger, as he that was born among them; half of them over against Mount Gerizim, and half of them over against Mount Ebal; as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded before, that they should bless the people of Israel. And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua

read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them." (Josh. viii. 33—35.)

36. On this Dr. Colenso assumes :—

(1.) That what was read was the whole of the Mosaic law, and not merely that portion of it which Moses commanded them to read at that place.

(2.) That Joshua read the whole with his single voice.

(3.) That every man, woman, and child in Israel must have heard him.

All the three assumptions appear to me to be erroneous.

37. As to Dr. Colenso's first assumption :—

(1.) It would *à priori* seem probable that that only would be read which was commanded to be read.

(2.) The writer appears to have purposely restricted the universality of the phrase "the words of the law," by the immediate addition of the words "the blessings and the cursings" (*πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου, τὰς εὐλογίας καὶ τὰς κατάρas*). Dr. Colenso, with characteristic inaccuracy, paraphrases the sentence by "every word of all that Moses commanded, WITH the blessings and the cursings,"—so altering the whole sense of the passage.

(3.) The statement that "there was not a word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua read not," seems intended to restrict his reading to that which Moses commanded to be read.

And this appears to me to be the fair interpretation of the passage.

38. As to Dr. Colenso's second assumption :—

(1.) It is stated that he read the blessings and the cursings according to all that is written in the book of the law. But in the book of the law it is very clearly and positively written that the Levites were to read them, and it seems very improbable that so precise and distinct a command should have been overlooked.

(2.) And in the preceding verse special attention is drawn to

the mode in which the blessings were to be pronounced. It was done as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded before, that they should bless the people of Israel.

It seems to me, therefore, highly probable that the blessings and cursings were actually pronounced by the Levites, and that Joshua merely *caused* them to be read. So in the verses immediately preceding those we are now considering, we are told that Joshua burnt Ai, hanged the king of Ai, built an altar to the Lord, and wrote a copy of the law thereon; not meaning, of course, in any one instance that his were the hands which performed the work. It seems to be a simple illustration of the maxim, *Quod facis per alium facis per te*.

39. Dr. Colenso's third assumption is that "we must suppose that at least the great body of the congregation was present, and not only present but able to hear the words of awful moment which Joshua addressed to them." (Colenso, 42.) I see no reason whatever for supposing so.

The children of Israel were in all probability well acquainted with the words and the import of the solemn ceremony which was being performed, and might well stand by as mere witnesses, and see, not hear, their great captain, or the Levites, go through the blessings and the cursings. How many out of the crowded multitudes who throng to witness some great public ceremony,—the opening of a bridge, of a dock, of an Exhibition, a presentation of prizes, a review, an election, a royal proclamation,—can hear the spoken words? How many of the eager listening ears around can catch the accents of the Bishop of Rome when he delivers his Easter blessing to the City and the World?

## CHAPTER V.

THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH THE  
PRIEST'S DUTIES.

40. "AND the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock shall he (the priest) carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out there shall he be burnt." (Lev. iv. 11, 12.)

Of this passage Dr. Colenso offers the following amazing interpretation:—"We have to imagine the priest having himself to carry *on his back, on foot*, from St. Paul's to the outskirts of the Metropolis, the skin, and flesh, and head, and legs, and inwards, and dung, even the whole bullock."

41. Mr. Hoare pleasantly observes that no one could read these memorable words without foreseeing that there must inevitably be a break-down either of the priest or of Dr. Colenso.

And, in fact, the break-down of Dr. Colenso appears in this case to be quite complete, and even satisfactory to himself, since in his second Part he proposes the following *naïve* emendation:—For "on his back, on foot," read "perhaps with the help of others."

Perhaps also, (he might have added,) with the help of carts, wains, and beasts of burden, if necessary for his purpose.

42. The extravagant absurdity of one interpretation is surely a cogent reason for adopting the other. And here the interpretation which would give a rational and consistent meaning to the passage, is also precisely the



one which would commend itself to the common sense of every reader. Few, if any, excepting Dr. Colenso, of the many millions who have read this passage, ever dreamed that it commanded the priest, (whose dignity is always guarded by so many minute provisions,) nay, even the high-priest himself, the great dignitary of the Jewish nation, to carry away the bullock with his own hands, on his own back, on foot. That the disposition of the remains of the sacrifices was an office which not only need not be performed by, but did not even require the presence of, the priest, may be gathered from the parallel passages, Levit. xvi. 27, 28, Numb. xix. 8—10.

43. Nor must it be forgotten that whether the Mosaic ritual was or was not worded with a special reference to the camp in the wilderness, it was at any rate to be carried out literally and fully in the land of Canaan throughout all ages. And the writer of the Pentateuch, whoever he might be, and at whatever period of the Jewish history he might have flourished, could hardly have intended to represent the priest as carrying out the offal of the sacrifices on his back, on foot, I will not say six miles, but six feet or six inches.

I think, however, that when we come (*infra*, chap. viii.) to consider Dr. Colenso's 20th chapter, we shall have reason to believe that neither at its first delivery (recorded in the Book of Leviticus) nor at its subsequent recapitulation (recorded in the Book of Deuteronomy) was the ceremonial law intended for observance in the wilderness. In each case its delivery was delayed until the Israelites were, or were supposed to be, about to enter the land of settlement, about to leave the wilderness for ever. And the occasional references to the camp would seem in general to point, not to the camp in the wilderness at all, but to the camp in the land of

Canaan, in which the Tabernacle of God was pitched, and which remained for many generations the civil and religious head-quarters of the nation.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH THE DAILY NECESSITIES OF THE PEOPLE.

44. I WILL state this difficulty in Dr. Colenso's own words:—

“The people could not surely all have gone outside the camp for the necessities of nature, as commanded in Deut. xxiii. 12—14. There were the aged and infirm, women in childbirth, sick persons and young children, who could not have done this; and indeed the command itself supposes the person to have a ‘paddle’ upon his ‘weapon,’ and, therefore, must be understood to apply only to the males, or rather only to the 600,000 warriors. But the very fact that this direction for ensuring cleanliness, ‘For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp: therefore shall thy camp be holy; that He see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee,’ would have been so limited in its application, is itself a very convincing proof of the unhistorical character of the whole narrative.” (Colenso, 44.)

I pass over the animus displayed in this passage, the determination to raise an objection whether the command is or is not to be restricted to the 600,000 warriors, and proceed to shew that the command itself, which is the subject of this “very convincing” objection, has not the slightest application either to the aged and infirm, the women in childbirth, the sick persons, the young children, or the 600,000 warriors.

45. It is expressly and repeatedly stated in the Book of Deuteronomy that its laws were intended to come into operation *after* the Israelites had obtained possession of Canaan. "These are the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments, which the Lord your God commanded, to teach you, *that ye might do them in the land whither ye go to possess it.*" (vi. 1.) "These are the statutes and judgments which *ye shall observe to do in the land, which the Lord God of thy fathers giveth thee to possess it.*" (xii. 1.) There are many such passages in Deuteronomy.

And there is hardly a precept throughout the Book which does not (by some reference to houses, vineyards, cities, and the like) carry within itself conclusive evidence that it has reference to a land of settlement, and can have no application to the state of things in the wilderness.

46. Before adverting to the particular passage to which Dr. Colenso excepts, let us glance very briefly over the surrounding chapters.

Chapter xix. is expressly directed to certain acts which are to be done "when the Lord thy God hath cut off the nations, whose land the Lord thy God giveth thee, and thou succeedest them, and dwellest in their cities, and in their houses."

Chapter xx. commences with a series of precepts as to military expeditions undertaken in the land of Canaan. "When thou goest out to battle against thine enemies, . . . the officers shall say, Who is he that hath built a new *house*? . . . let him return to his *house*. . . . And what man is he that hath planted a *vineyard*? . . . let him also return to his *house*;" and so on.

The first verse of chap. xxi. gives directions as to what they shall do "if one be found slain in *the land*, which the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it." The 10th verse again refers to military expeditions, and prescribes the treatment of a captive, "who shall remain in thine *house*." The 19th verse directs a father to take a rebellious son to the elders of the *city*.

Chapter xxii. also treats of building new *houses*, (ver. 8); planting *vineyards*, (ver. 9); of appeals to the elders of the *city*, (ver. 15); of punishments to be inflicted at the gate of the city, (ver. 24).

Chapter xxiii. allows an escaping servant to dwell "in one of thy *gates*," i.e. cities, (ver. 16); warns the people to take no usury, "that the Lord thy God may bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it," (ver. 20); and speaks of the vineyards and standing corn of a neighbour, (vers. 24, 25).

The 24th chapter teaches how a divorced wife is to depart out of the *house*, (vers. 1, 2); allows a newly married man to remain at home, free from all military service for a year, (ver. 5); forbids a creditor to enter his debtor's house, (ver. 10); forbids oppression of the stranger "within thy gates," (ver. 14); and speaks of vineyards, olive-trees, and harvests, (vers. 19—21).

We find, therefore, that all the surrounding precepts have reference not to the camp in the wilderness, but to the settlements in the land of Canaan, where the people should have cities and houses, and fields, vineyards, olives, and corn.

47. In the 23rd chapter, in the midst of all these provisions, and without any mark of difference, comes the one to which Dr. Colenso objects. It is as follows:—

"When the host goeth forth against thine enemies, then keep thee from every wicked thing. If there be among you any man, that is not clean by reason of uncleanness that chanceth him by night, then shall he go abroad out of the camp, he shall not come within the camp: but it shall be, when evening cometh on, he shall wash himself with water: and when the sun is down, he shall come into the camp again. Thou shalt have a place also without the camp, whither thou shalt go forth abroad: and thou shalt have a paddle upon thy weapon; and it shall be, when thou wilt ease thyself abroad, thou shalt dig therewith, and shalt turn back and cover that which cometh from thee: for the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee; therefore shall thy camp be holy: that He see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee." (vers. 9—14.)

In this case, as in many others, to cite the passage objected to is in truth to answer the objection.

For is it not really self-evident that the passage does not even refer to the camp in the wilderness at all; that like the passages cited above from xx. 1, xxi. 10, (and many others might be added,) it refers only to military expeditions in the land of Canaan, composed it may be of 500, 5,000, or 50,000 troops; that it is in fact, so to say, a sanitary regulation enforced by religious sanctions? Dr. Colenso has, I think, been misled by the occurrence of the word "camp" in the verses.

48. In explanation of the labour he has bestowed in attempting to expose the fallacies of Hengstenberg and others, Dr. Colenso (Preface, p. xxviii.) cites the following remarks:—

"We should feel a humiliation to contend with such sophistries seriously and in detail, were we not firmly convinced that to do so is not merely the *most legitimate* but also the *only* mode by which truth can be rendered permanently triumphant. Wit and sarcasm may obtain a temporary success; they may awaken minds otherwise prepared for freedom; but they are often unjust, usually unbenevolent, and consequently, in the majority of cases, they merely awaken antagonism, and cause men to cling with increased fondness to their opinions. Nothing but minute, searching, and inexorable argument will ever obtain a speedy or a permanent triumph over deep-seated prejudices."

These are wise observations; and not applicable exclusively to Dr. Colenso's side of the question. It is only by constantly keeping them in mind that I am enabled to persevere in an otherwise distasteful task.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE IDENTITY OF THE NUMBERS IN EXODUS XXXVIII. AND NUMBERS I.

49. "AND the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them, when thou numberest them. This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary: an half shekel shall be the offering of the Lord." (Exod. xxx. 11—13.)

On this Dr. Colenso remarks that "these words direct that whenever a numbering of the people shall take place, each one that is numbered shall pay a ransom for his soul of half a shekel. Now in Exod. xxxviii. 26 we read of such a tribute being paid, 'a bekah for every man, that is, half a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary, for every one that went to be numbered, from twenty years old and upward;' that is, the atonement money is collected: but nothing is here said of any census being taken. On the other hand, in Numb. i. 1—46, (more than six months after the date of the former occasion,) we have an account of a very formal numbering of the people, the result being given for each particular tribe, and the total number summed up at the end: here the census is made, but there is no indication of any atonement-money being paid." (Colenso, 47.)

And then the objection is that "it is surprising that the number of adult males should have been identically the same (603,550) on the first occasion as it was half

a year afterwards." (Colenso, 47.) Is it conceivable that none should have come of age during that time?

And I admit, That it is not conceivable: that considering the prodigious fertility of the Israelites in Egypt, it is impossible to believe that nineteen years before the Exodus, a whole period of six months should have elapsed during which there was born no single child who lived to the age of twenty.

50. Dr. Colenso is very precise in his statement that the two events took place at an interval of half-a-year. He states it positively in the heading of the chapter, and several times in the chapter itself. I find nothing in Scripture to fix the exact interval. The second event took place on the first day of the second month of the second year, (Numb. i. 1,) exactly one month after the tabernacle was erected, (Exodus xl. 1): the first event took place during its construction. I am not aware of any passage which speaks of the time occupied in the construction, or implies that it occupied so long a period as six months. However, it may be so.

51. But if we look narrowly at the facts, we shall, I think, see great reason to believe that both the narratives relate to one and the same transaction. When the tabernacle was erecting, there was a general numbering of the people, not according to their tribes or their families, but simply *per capita*. Every man brought his half-shekel, and entered his number. The whole number was found to be 603,550 men. The tabernacle being finished, the people were to march at once upon the land of Canaan. Hitherto they had all journeyed in one vast body, but now each family was to be distinguished by its own ensign, each tribe to occupy a separate camp, and be ranged beneath a separate standard.

"Every man of the children of Israel shall pitch by his own standard, with the ensign of their father's house." (Numb. ii. 2.)

"And the children of Israel did according to all that the Lord commanded Moses: so they pitched by their standards, and so they set forward, every one after their families, according to the house of their fathers." (Numb. ii. 34.)

It was, therefore, absolutely necessary that these 603,550 men should be sorted and arranged into their tribes, should be registered and marshalled *κατὰ συγγενείας αὐτῶν, κατὰ δήμους αὐτῶν, κατ' οἴκους πατριῶν αὐτῶν*. The general number being known, nothing more was wanted than to separate them according to their pedigrees, to check and draft them off into their several divisions. And this appears to be precisely what was done on the occasion recorded in the first chapter of Numbers.

52. The command was—

"Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel, after their families (*κατὰ συγγενείας*), by the house of their fathers (*κατ' οἴκους πατριῶν αὐτῶν*), with the number of their names (*κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν*), every male by their polls (*κατὰ κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν*); from twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel: thou and Aaron shall number them by their armies." (Numb. i. 2, 3.)

And the way in which it was fulfilled was—

"They assembled all the congregation together on the first day of the second month, *and they declared their pedigrees after their families, by the house of their fathers*, according to the number of the names, from twenty years old and upward, by their polls." (Numb. i. 18.)

Then follows a list of the numbers of each tribe, all expressed in almost identical language:—

"And the children of Reuben, Israel's eldest son, by their generations, after their families, by the house of their fathers



(κατὰ συγγενείας αὐτῶν, κατὰ δήμους αὐτῶν, κατ' οἴκους πατριῶν αὐτῶν), according to the number of their names, by their polls, every male from twenty years old and upward, all that were able to go forth to war; those that were numbered of them, even of the tribe of Reuben, were 46,500." (Numb. i. 20, 21.)

And after going through the twelve tribes in this manner, the historian adds up their numbers in the 46th verse, as if to see whether they agree with the sum total, 603,550. And finds that the two numbers tally exactly.

53. Nor is it difficult to understand why on the second occasion, and not on the first, twelve men were selected, one from each tribe, every one head of the house of his fathers, to conduct the arrangement in conjunction with Moses and Aaron. (Numbers i. 4.) When merely the general number of the whole people was taken, this precaution was needless, but when that general number was to be apportioned and allotted among the several tribes, it was well that an officer of each tribe should be present, to check the transaction, and preclude all suspicion of inaccuracy or unfairness.

54. Add to this the extreme improbability that two distinct and separate numberings should have taken place, or should be represented as taking place, within so short a space of time, of the same people at the same spot, for the same purposes, on the same principle, and to the same extent. Nothing of the kind occurs elsewhere in Scripture. Nor had any event been noticed in the meantime which could render a second general numbering in any degree necessary or desirable.

55. Nor must the identity of the numbers be entirely overlooked as being of itself a cogent proof of the identity of the census. The only answer which Dr. Colenso

vouchsafes to this suggestion is a note of admiration, but he seems in this instance to have forgotten his own sound maxim, that Wit may dazzle but does not convince.

56. There really, therefore, seems every reason to believe that the two events were a part of the same transaction, the first being the general numbering *per capita*, the second, the registration *per stirpes*.

57. And this is substantially Hävernicks's view, who says :—

“The census in the first year was required in order to levy the impost for the erection of the Tabernacle, the other to decide the order of the encampment and march. The latter object did not require a census properly so called. All that was necessary was, to have a review of the tribes; and as the former census was made the basis, it is evident that it was only a review of the numbers of each tribe that was designed. It is clear from the text itself that this is no arbitrary opinion. Prominent expression is here given to the fact that the new numbering was made after their families, according to the house of their fathers. (Numbers i. 2, 18.) This was the only necessary addition to the first numbering. But that the latter was made use of is both probable in itself, and is confirmed by the agreement of the sum total in each.”

58. In order to reply to this theory Dr. Colenso finds himself for once in accordance with Kurtz. “We can only say with Kurtz, if the numbers in both instances are founded upon one and the same census, we must look for the census in question, not to Exod. xxxviii., but to Numbers i.” (Colenso, 52.) And the only argument by which Kurtz supports this view is as follows: “We are shut up to this by the solemnity and formality with

which the census in Numbers i. was commanded, organized, and carried out. In Exodus xxxviii. we have simply the raising of a tax and no numbering at all." (Colenso, 48.)

I am bound to say that Dr. Colenso could not have selected a more unlucky point on which to declare his solitary adhesion to Kurtz. For how it can be said that there was no numbering in Exodus xxxviii. I am at a loss to conceive.

The 25th verse of the chapter is, "And the silver of *them that were numbered* of the congregation was 100 talents and 1,775 shekels." And the 26th, "A bekah for every man, for *every one that went to be numbered*, for 603,550 men." The very number is given, not left to be deduced from the offerings.

59. Were it otherwise, we might derive another argument (*valeat quantum*) from Dr. Colenso's own statement, cited above, that whereas it is ordered that on every census atonement-money should be paid, we in fact read of but one census and but one payment of atonement-money.

For I think that few who are aware how frequently Dr. Colenso dismisses a not unreasonable suggestion with the observation that "there is no hint of this in Scripture" will be prepared for the manner in which he disposes of this obvious argument for the identity of the census. "The omission in each case might be considered, of course, as accidental, it being supposed that in the first instance the numbering really took place, and in the second the tribute was paid, though neither circumstance is mentioned." (Colenso, 47.)

But although Dr. Colenso's statement, that there is no mention of any numbering in Exodus xxxviii., is made with his habitual inaccuracy, it is I believe the fact that

there is mention of but one payment of atonement-money. And this accords with the idea that in Numbers i. we have only a *declaration of pedigrees*. (ver. 18.)

60. There is yet another remarkable circumstance connected with this double numbering, which Dr. Colenso does not notice, but which (in whatever light it is viewed) seems fatal to his objection.

For if we are to be tied down to the exact amount of information which the writer gives us, if we are not permitted to supply any omission, to suggest any probability, if we are to follow the plain words of Scripture without employing our critical faculties to explain and adjust them, we shall find that it is *not* true, that it is *not* the fact, that "the number of adult males was identically the same on the first occasion as it was half-a-year afterwards," but that there was on the second occasion an actual increase of several thousands.

In the numbering of Exodus xxxviii. there is no hint that any tribe, any class, any body of men was excluded from the census.

In the numbering of Numbers i. we are expressly told (ver. 47) that the whole tribe of the Levites was excluded.

And if these were two distinct numberings, there is no pretence whatever for making these words apply also to the first occasion, or for supposing that the Levites were omitted there. Why should they be? They were not then chosen for the service of the sanctuary; they were not then substituted for the firstborn; they were not then about to occupy a separate camp, a separate position, distinguished from all the rest of Israel. They were then merely as one of the twelve ordinary tribes.

But if, as I cannot doubt, Dr. Colenso is right in supposing that the numbering in each case extended over

the same area, then the unnoticed omission of the Levites in the first instance appears to me a striking witness to the identity of the census.

For if the general and promiscuous census, in the first instance, was but a preliminary to the disposition and registration of the persons then numbered, into their respective tribes, the exclusion of the Levites from the general census is amply explained and accounted for; since it was on that supplemental registration that they were drafted off into a separate camp to undertake the exclusive service of the tabernacle of God.

“*The children of Israel* shall pitch their tents, every man by his own camp, and every man by his own standard, throughout their hosts. But *the Levites* shall pitch round about the tabernacle.” Numb. i. 52, 53. And it was on the same occasion that they were exchanged for the firstborn and appointed to serve and minister about the holy place. It was, therefore, but right and proper that they should be omitted from the preliminary census on which this supplemental registration was based.

I think we may go still further, and consider that the order given in Numbers i. 47—50 was primarily and mainly applicable to the census of Exodus xxxviii. For if, as appears, each tribe was on the second occasion numbered singly, it might be asked how the Levites were practically excluded at all. They also were numbered singly (Numb. iii.) on the same occasion, although on a different principle.

But supposing them to have been excluded on the first occasion, when the aggregate number (603,550) was ascertained, it is natural that the author, when he is going through the tribes singly, and finds that he has already arrived at the same sum total although he has not yet reckoned in the Levites, should explain that the

Levites had never been included in that aggregate number at all. "For the Lord had spoken unto Moses, saying, Only thou shalt not number the tribe of Levi, neither take the sum of them among the children of Israel: but thou shalt appoint the Levites over the tabernacle of testimony." (Numbers i. 48—50.)

These last words serve to indicate another reason (if both events were part of the same transaction) for the exclusion of the Levites from the general census. For as the atonement-money, which was paid by "every one that went to be numbered," was also "to be appointed for the service of the tabernacle," (Exod. xxx. 16,) the personal service of the Levites might well be accepted in its stead. (See Exod. xxxviii. 21.)

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE NUMBER OF THE PRIESTS AT THE EXODUS COMPARED WITH THEIR DUTIES AND WITH THE PROVISION MADE FOR THEM.

61. THE view of the Mosaic law which is most prominent, not only in the Pentateuch, but throughout the whole of Scripture, is that it was the covenant, the condition, the tenure, on which the land of promise was to be held. These multitudinous sacrifices, these ceremonies, and rites, and laws, were in fact the suits and services by, under, and subject to which the Israelites held the land of Canaan at the will of Almighty God. The land was His, and they were strangers and sojourners with Him. (Lev. xxv. 23.) So long as they should perform this covenant, and observe this condition, the quiet enjoyment of the land was guaranteed to them and their children, to be a perpetual heritage throughout all generations. But if, like Adam, they should transgress

and forsake the covenant, if they should break the condition, they were warned that a forfeiture would ensue, that they should perish from off the land which the Lord their God gave them to possess it. God gave His people the lands of the heathen, and they took the labours of the nations into possession, not only that they might, but also on condition that they did, keep His statutes and observe His laws. It is needless to cite particular passages in support of a view which pervades the whole of Scripture, and is familiar to every reader. The 26th chapter of the original law (Leviticus), and the 29th chapter of the recapitulation (Deuteronomy), or Deut. iv. 23—26, may be taken as specimens of the whole. The observance of the covenant and the tenure of the land are everywhere indissolubly connected.

62. And when were the precise terms of this covenant announced? It would seem that their original delivery was delayed until just before the people for the first time reached the borders of the land of promise. During the whole year of their original wanderings in the wilderness, the services by which the children of Israel were to hold their land had not been formally delivered. On the morning of the second year the tabernacle was erected; and it was after that—probably during the ensuing month—that the great promulgation of the law took place which we call the Book of Leviticus. Immediately afterwards, the people are arranged and marshalled according to their tribes, and the whole nation moves at once upon the promised land. A few short scenes of war and victory, and all would be over; the tabernacle would be reared in the camp within the land of settlement; and Israel should do God's statutes, and keep His judgments, and do them; and dwell in the land in safety. (Lev. xxv. 18.)

We all know how these fair hopes were frustrated, and how the people returned, weary and rebellious, to spend forty more years wandering in the wilderness.

63. Again, at the end of those forty years, they stand on the verge of the land of promise, and again the terms of the covenant are promulgated in full. The generation which had listened to their first delivery had passed away, and it was necessary to recapitulate and enforce them anew.

64. No such necessity would have existed had the law been in full operation during the forty years. Why recount again minute precepts and ordinances which the people had been all their lives observing, and which must by that time have become a part of their daily and habitual duties?

The very existence of the Book of Deuteronomy, no less than the nature and reason of the thing, is a proof that the precepts of the Book of Leviticus had not been in use during the forty years' wanderings.

65. And if we look at the Book of Leviticus itself, we shall see this fact more clearly. Not only are there general declarations connecting the performance of the law with the possession of the land,—(as e.g. in xx. 22—25, “Ye shall therefore keep all My statutes, and all My judgments, and do them: that the land, whither I bring you to dwell therein, spue you not out. And ye shall not walk in the manners of the nation, which I cast out before you: for they committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them. But I have said unto you, Ye shall inherit their land, and I will give it unto you to possess it, a land that floweth with milk and honey: I am the Lord your God, which have separated you from other people. Ye shall therefore,” &c.; and so in many other passages,)—but in addition to this, the



great bulk of the precepts presuppose that the people to obey them are living in a fertile and settled land.

We hear of firstfruits and green ears of corn, (ii. 12, 14); of fish in the rivers, (xi. 9); of stone houses, (xiv. 45); of strangers sojourning among them, (xvii. 8, &c.), whose position is compared to that of the Israelites in Egypt, (xix. 34,) and distinguished from that of persons born in the *land*, (xxii. 11); of sins which will defile their land, (xviii. 24—28); of harvests and vineyards, (xix. 9, 10, xxiii. *passim*); of the sale and redemption of land, (xxv. 23, 24); of villages, and cities, walled cities, and suburbs of cities, (xxv. 29, 31, 32, 34); of families of strangers begotten in the land, (xxv. 45); and a variety of similar matters. And see the whole of chap. xxvi.

66. And when we come to the republication of the law in Deuteronomy the same feature strikes us in almost every chapter. In fact, the writer states in the plainest terms, (1) that the original delivery of the law (the Book of Leviticus) was intended to be put in force in the land of Canaan; and (2) that this second delivery of the law (the Book of Deuteronomy) is also intended for the same purpose.

(1.) "Behold, I *have* taught you (*δέδειχα ὑμῖν*) statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, *that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it.*" (iv. 5.)

"And the Lord commanded me at that time" (at Horeb, i.e. Mount Sinai) "to teach you statutes and judgments, *that ye might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it.*" (iv. 14.)

"The Lord said unto me," (at Mount Sinai,) "I will speak unto thee all the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which thou shalt teach them, *that they may do them in the land which I give them to possess it.*" (v. 31.)

Now what are these commandments, statutes, and judgments, which the Lord had at Sinai commanded Moses to teach, and which Moses had taught the people? None other than this very Book of Leviticus.

The last verse of the Book of Leviticus is, "THESE are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai." And the last verse of the preceding chapter, "THESE are the statutes and judgments and laws, which the Lord made between Him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses."

(2.) And so with regard to the recapitulation itself it is said, "These are the statutes and judgments, which ye shall observe to do in the land, which the Lord God of thy fathers giveth thee to possess it." (xii. 1, and cf. iv. 1, 40, vi. 1, xi. 31, 32, &c.) These are a few specimens out of a vast multitude of similar instances.

The passages mentioned in paragraph (2), though referring only to the republished law, are equally conclusive with regard to the original law; for how could the writer have said that these were the statutes for their observance after they should acquire possession of the land, if these were the very statutes which, under the original delivery of the law, they had been for forty years observing?

So also in the Book of Numbers, chap. xv., the laws of the burnt-offering, meat-offering, drink-offering, heave-offering, sin-offering, &c., though delivered apparently after the denunciation, but before the commencement, of the forty years' wandering in the wilderness, are ushered in with the common form, "When ye be come to the land of your habitation: then ye shall," &c. And indeed the very first ceremonies prescribed at Sinai bore exclusive reference to the land of Canaan. (Exod. xxi.—xxiii.)

67. Let us look further to some individual instances. If we were called upon to single out the two great ceremonial observances which specially distinguished the children of Israel, we should, I think, select Circumcision and the Passover. Were these observed in the wilderness?

That circumcision was not observed, we are expressly told. (Joshua v. 5—8.)

"Now all the people that came out were circumcised: but all the people that were born in the wilderness by the way as

they came forth out of Egypt, them they had not circumcised. For the children of Israel walked forty years in the wilderness, till all the people that were men of war, which came out of Egypt, were consumed, because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord. . . . And their children, whom he raised up in their stead, them Joshua circumcised: for they were uncircumcised, because they had not circumcised them by the way."

As regards the Passover, we have no such express declaration; but we find that the single observance of it, which is mentioned during the whole sojourn in the wilderness, required a fresh and special command of Almighty God, (Numb. ix. 2); and it is, I believe, the received opinion, grounded on the silence of Scripture, that it was never kept again until the reproach of Egypt had been rolled away by the circumcision at Gilgal. (Joshua v. 9, 10.)

But if these two great distinguishing rites were thus neglected, is it conceivable that the lesser and minute observances of the law intended expressly for the land of Canaan, should have been kept up during the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness?

68. And is there any ground for supposing that they were? So far as I know, the only imaginable ground for such a supposition is the occasional use of the word "camp" in the ordinances.

Now it is plain that the Book of Leviticus assumes to be delivered at the moment when the children of Israel were about to pass into the land of promise; and that the use of the word "camp" is in no way of necessity connected with the wilderness; while the word *אֶמְקָא* has no necessary reference to camp-life at all.

The first delivery of the law was made under precisely the same circumstances as the second delivery, forty years after. Let us see, therefore, the events which followed after the second delivery.

Almost immediately afterwards (Deut. i. 3, xxxiv. 8; Joshua iv. 19) the people pass through Jordan, enter

upon the promised land, encamp at Gilgal, and renew the rite of circumcision, (Joshua iii., iv., v.,) the earliest symbol of the covenant, (Gen. xvii. 7—10).

“I will establish My covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant *therefore*, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is My covenant, which ye shall keep, between Me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised.”

At once, without any fresh command, as a matter of course now that they are within the limits of “the land,” the covenant becomes in full force, the law springs into immediate operation; they keep the Passover at its appointed season; the manna ceases with the cessation of the provisional state in which they had dwelt in the wilderness, and they eat of the fruit of their own promised land. Then warlike operations commence; the troops are despatched in every direction; they pitch before Ai, (viii. 11,) they take three days’ journey to Gibeon, (ix. 17,) they encamp at Makkedah, (x. 21,) at Lachish, (x. 31,) at Eglon, (x. 34); but through all these movements the great CAMP itself remains stationary at Gilgal, (ix. 6, x. 6, 15, 43,) the resting-place of the tabernacle of God, the head-quarters of the invading nation. And when the work was done, and they had won their homes, the tabernacle is set up at Shiloh, (xviii. 1,) still surrounded by the camp, (xviii. 9); and there it remained until the time of Samuel, the civil and religious head-quarters of the people. (Judges xviii. 31, xxi. 12; 1 Sam. iv. 4.) In later times the Holy City, as the *entourage*

of the temple, appears to have taken the place of the camp which surrounded the tabernacle. See Heb. xiii. 11—13.

Now it must be remembered that what did actually happen immediately after the delivery of Deuteronomy, is what was proposed and intended to happen immediately after the delivery of Leviticus.

If, therefore, the narrative shews, as it does most plainly shew, that the camp was, immediately after the delivery of the law, to be transferred from the wilderness to the land of Canaan, and that therefore any allusion to the camp in the Book of Deuteronomy must of necessity refer to the camp in Canaan, and not to the camp in the wilderness, so also must any such allusion in the Book of Leviticus.

The word, where found in Leviticus, can surely have nothing to do with the wanderings in the desert—wanderings which were not then even contemplated; and the fact of their having subsequently taken place cannot vary the signification which the word must bear in the Book. There seems to be no reference throughout the Book of Leviticus to the camp in the *wilderness*. Indeed, I believe that the word *wilderness* only occurs in one command, and then in such a way as conclusively to shew that the performance of the command was not to take place until the Israelites had left the wilderness and come to a land inhabited. It occurs in the command relating to the scape-goat, which as every one knows was to be, and was, sent out every year on the great day of atonement to bear the sins of the people into the wilderness. But the writer did not contemplate the wilderness as surrounding the tabernacle when the command was in operation. His words are,—“He shall send the goat away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and

the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." (Lev. xvi. 21, 22.) Do not these words imply that the goat was to be sent from an inhabited land, and not from the wilderness itself?

It is, no doubt, likely enough that the children of Israel, knowing what their duties would be in the land of Canaan, should have endeavoured in some measure, while yet in the wilderness, to anticipate those duties, as a grateful offering to Almighty God; as indeed, even before the delivery of the law, they were accustomed to offer burnt-offerings and sacrifices to the Lord God of their fathers. (Exod. x. 25, xviii. 12.) But at least it is not unreasonable to believe that they would not perform in the wilderness the rites which were there incapable of performance.

69. There is, however, one command which Dr. Colenso singles out for detailed examination.

Every woman, some weeks or months after childbirth, was to bring to the Lord a lamb for a burnt-offering, and a turtle-dove or a young pigeon for a sin-offering; or if she were too poor for that, then she might bring two turtle-doves or two young pigeons for the two offerings. (Lev. xii.)

And Dr. Colenso reckons that there must have been on the average 250 births, and therefore (on this account only) 500 sacrifices, daily; and that, as each sacrifice must have occupied at least five minutes, the whole must have occupied 2,500 minutes, or nearly 42 hours daily, and so "could not have been offered in a single day of 12 hours, though each of the three priests" (to whom Dr. Colenso considers the priesthood to have been confined in the wilderness) "had been employed in the one sole incessant labour of offering them, without a mo-

ment's rest or interruption." And besides, "In the desert it would have been equally impossible for rich or poor to procure the pigeons." (Colenso, 148—153.)

Foreseeing apparently that a reader might say, "But do not these considerations go to prove that this command, like all the rest, may have been intended for the land of Canaan?" Dr. Colenso at once silences the inconvenient questioner by the following dogmatic and authoritative statement:—

"It CANNOT BE SAID that the laws which require the sacrifice of such birds, were intended only to suit the circumstances of a later time, when the people should be finally settled in the land of Canaan. As to this point Hävernicks writes, evidently not perceiving the difficulty before us, but stating the truth as it would appear to any ordinary reader, 'Others also of these legal appointments bear the mark of being framed at a time when all the individuals of the nation were so situated as to be at no great distance from the tabernacle. Uncleanliness by issue of blood, &c., and that of women in childbed, require to be removed and atoned for by the personal presentation of offerings in the sanctuary, &c.' " (Colenso, 151.)

70. Dr. Colenso does not seem to observe that by citing this observation from Hävernicks he has struck away the only foundation on which it could possibly rest. It rests entirely on the assumption that the precept was more applicable to the state of things in the wilderness than to that in the land of Canaan. But as adopted by Dr. Colenso it is made to form part of this singular train of argument: The precept would be inconvenient in Canaan, impossible in the wilderness; its inconvenience in Canaan shews that it is rather applicable, and must have been intended to apply, to lo-

calities where it was altogether impossible. And this is a "critical examination!" These are arguments adapted and reduced to suit the intellectual capacity of the English laity!

71. But how strange that any should suggest that this precept was inapplicable to the land of settlement! How strange to select for that purpose the very individual precept which, all the world knows, was observed through the whole period of the Jewish sojourn in Canaan, down to the expiring moments of the Commonwealth! All the world knows the solemn scene when the Redeemer was borne to His own shrine, Himself to be redeemed, and the Virgin Mother laid down before the altar such offerings as poor matrons pay, a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons. This was no affectation of unusual and ostentatious legal strictness; no revival of an obsolete custom; no zeal of a learned antiquarian; it was but the simple offering of a lowly, unobtrusive woman, doing what those around her did—doing what she had been taught to believe was "commanded in the law of the Lord." (St. Luke ii. 22—39.) Inconvenient it might be, as the command that three times a-year all the males should go up to the Holy City (Deut. xvi. 16) must have been,—as many, if not most, of the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic law must have been; but it seems never to have occurred to the Jewish matrons that it was meant for another state of society, and was inapplicable to their position in the land of promise.

73. And the reader will not, I hope, have forgotten that notwithstanding Dr. Colenso's positive assertion that "it cannot be said" that these sacrifices were intended only for the land of Canaan, it is pretty clearly so said, and that too in the Book of Deuteronomy. (Supr. 66, (1).)



## CHAPTER IX.

THE PRIESTS AND THEIR DUTIES AT THE CELEBRATION  
OF THE PASSOVER.

73. WE have already seen (supr. 69) that in Dr. Colenso's opinion there were but three priests among the Israelites in the wilderness. And we have now to consider "how these three priests managed at the celebration of the Passover." (Colenso, 159.) For we know that the Passover was once celebrated in the wilderness of Sinai, (supr. 67). Let us see, then, what part the priests would take in that celebration.

74. In considering this question I must ask the reader to confine his attention for the present to the statements of Scripture. The Passover was the great distinguishing ordinance of the Jews, and it is inconceivable that Scripture, ordinarily so minute with regard to the details of the sacrificial system, and especially so with regard to the Passover, should have omitted any essential or important point in its celebration.

I must ask him, too, to bear in mind the distinction between the Paschal lamb which was slain on the evening of the 14th of Abib, and the general feast of the Passover (or of unleavened bread) which commenced on the 15th and lasted seven days.

75. The sacrifice of the paschal lamb was neither a burnt-offering, nor a sin-offering, nor a peace-offering. It was simply a memorial feast; a domestic commemoration of the great deliverance.

The full details of its institution and of the manner of celebrating it are to be found in the 12th chapter of Exodus.

Each house, each family, was to take a lamb, (vers. 3, 21);

all the assembly were to kill it in the evening of the 14th, (ver. 6); they were to sprinkle the blood on the top and the sides of the door, (ver. 7); to roast the flesh and eat it that night, (ver. 9); no part of it was to be carried out of the house, (ver. 46); or kept until the morning, (ver. 10).

Nothing can be more plain and simple than the narrative. Each householder was to manage for himself: there is not only no trace of any priestly intervention, but the details are incompatible with it.

76. But was this ordinance provisional only? Did it provide only for this particular celebration of the Passover? or was it meant for all time?

The narrative itself is clear on this point. "When ye be come to the land which the Lord will give you, ye shall keep this service." (ver. 25; and see vers. 14, 17, 24, 26, 48, 49.) It was an ordinance to them and to their sons for ever.

Some parts of it, indeed, were exclusively prospective. The holy convocations that accompanied the feast of unleavened bread belonged only to the future. The week which followed the first Passover was fully occupied with those striking events which culminated in the triumphant passage of the Red Sea.

It is clear, therefore, that this was intended to be a permanent ordinance. Altered and modified it no doubt might be, to suit their altered circumstances from time to time, but the general scheme was delivered once for all.

77. The manner of observing the feast of unleavened bread being incompatible with the circumstances of the first Passover, is only sketched in outline in the ordinance of its institution; the details are left to be afterwards supplied.

The 23rd chapter of Leviticus supplies them in part: it ordains that there was to be an offering made by fire unto the Lord on each of the seven days. (ver. 8.)

*And no other ordinance was issued on the subject until after the celebration of the Passover in the wilderness.*

It is not indeed by any means certain that this ordinance itself preceded it. The probability seems strongly the other way. The Passover was celebrated on the 14th day of the first month of the second year. (Numbers ix. 1—3.) The tabernacle was erected on the first day of that month. (Exod. xl. 17.) Then followed (whether immediately or not we do not know) the consecration of Aaron and his sons: this took eight days. (Lev. ix. 1.) Then Aaron's sons died; and it is not until after this that the precepts in question are delivered. It is therefore, to say the least, improbable that they were delivered before the 14th, especially as we know that there were a multitude of other events to occupy the time of Moses.

78. Here, then, we might part company with Dr. Colenso: for up to this time it is plain that the priests had no duties to perform with regard to the paschal lambs; and it can hardly be called criticism (whatever else it may be) to resort to a law delivered forty years afterwards,—to insist that that law must have been observed forty years before it was delivered,—to insist *then* that it could not possibly have been so observed,—and on these grounds to charge the history with an absurdity.

But I prefer to go on and examine the subject more thoroughly. The reader will, however, bear in mind that the laws we are now to consider were certainly delivered *after* the celebration of the Passover in the wilderness.

79. The details of the feast of unleavened bread are completed in the 28th chapter of Numbers. I must quote the ordinance in full.

“In the fourteenth day of the first month is the Passover of the Lord. And in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast: seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten. In the first day shall be an holy convocation; ye shall do no manner of

servile work therein : but ye shall offer a sacrifice made by fire for a burnt-offering unto the Lord ; two young bullocks, and one ram, and seven lambs of the first year : they shall be unto you without blemish : and their meat-offering shall be of flour mingled with oil : three tenth deals shall ye offer for a bullock, and two tenth deals for a ram ; a several tenth deal shalt thou offer for every lamb, throughout the seven lambs : and one goat for a sin-offering, to make an atonement for you. Ye shall offer these beside the burnt-offering in the morning, which is for a continual burnt-offering. After this manner ye shall offer daily, throughout the seven days, the meat of the sacrifice made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord : it shall be offered beside the continual burnt-offering, and his drink-offering. And on the seventh day ye shall have an holy convocation ; ye shall do no servile work.” (vers. 16—25.)

We see, therefore, that there was a special national burnt-offering at the Passover, consisting of two bullocks, one ram, seven lambs, and one goat, and quite distinct from the Paschal lamb itself.

Now what was the law of the burnt-offering ? It is stated in the first chapter of Leviticus. The priests were to bring the blood and sprinkle it round about the altar of burnt-offering ; they were then to flay the burnt-offering, cut it in pieces, and burn it upon the altar. (vers. 5—9.)

80. The Passover, therefore, according to its original institution, consisted of this domestic sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, on the evening of the 14th of Abib ; and of the solemn feast, accompanied by a national burnt-offering of eleven animals, on the seven following days.

*Nor did any subsequent ordinance vary or interfere with these arrangements in any particular.*

81. The only subsequent ordinance having any bearing on the celebration of the Passover is that contained in the 16th chapter of Deuteronomy. And this ordinance has no reference to the manner and form of celebration ; it merely fixes the locality in which the celebration shall take place.

“Thou mayest not sacrifice the Passover within any of thy gates” (i.e. cities, τῶν πόλεων σου) “which the Lord thy God giveth thee: but at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to place His name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the Passover at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt. And thou shalt roast and eat it in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose: and thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents. Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread: and on the seventh day shall be a solemn assembly to the Lord thy God: thou shalt do no servile work in it.” (xvi. 5—8.)

82. Was this an ordinance for the wilderness, or was it applicable to and intended for the land of Canaan only?

I need not refer to the considerations advanced in the preceding chapter, and which seemed to shew that the whole of the law was intended for the land of Canaan only, for we have additional and convincing proof that this provision, at any rate, was exclusively so intended.

This phrase, “the place which the Lord thy God shall choose,” is of frequent occurrence in the Book of Deuteronomy. Its meaning is fully explained in the chapter where it first occurs.

“Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes,” (the system of the law not being yet in operation). “For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance, which the Lord your God giveth you. *But when ye go over Jordan, and dwell in the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit, and when He giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety; then there shall be a place which the Lord thy God shall choose to cause His name to dwell there.*” (Deut. xii. 8—11.)

It is plain, therefore, (as indeed might have been concluded from the reference to cities in xvi. 5,) that the

ordinance in question had exclusive reference to the land of Canaan.

83. But a further question arises, viz., what is meant by "the place which the Lord shall choose?" Does it mean the temple, or does it mean the Holy City? (1 Kings viii. 16, 29, 44; Psalms xli. 5, lxxviii. 68, cxxxii. 13.)

It might mean either, but in the Book of Deuteronomy it seems clearly to mean the Holy City.

(1.) The very contrast, which is continually drawn, between "the place which the Lord shall choose" and the ordinary gates (i.e. cities) of the Israelites, seems to point to something larger than any individual building.

(2.) We see that the paschal lamb was to be not only sacrificed, (xvi. 6,) but also roasted and eaten, (ver. 7,) in the place which the Lord should choose; and it certainly was not to be roasted and eaten in the temple.

(3.) So, again, in chapter xii. they are ordered to *eat their tithes and offerings* (vers. 5—7, 18) in the place which the Lord their God should choose, unless it was too distant from them. (ver. 21.)

(4.) A similar precept is contained in chapter xiv. 23, but there it is added that if the place was too far from them which the Lord their God should choose to set His name there, they should turn the tithe into money, and go unto the place which the Lord their God should choose, and buy whatever their soul lusted after, and they should *eat there* before the Lord, and they should rejoice, they and their households. (vers. 24—26.)

(5.) So the firstlings of the bullocks and sheep are to be eaten before the Lord their God in the place which the Lord should choose by them and their households. (xv. 20.)

(6.) And in the feast of weeks (xvi. 11) and in the feast of tabernacles (xvi. 14) the whole population was to keep the feast and rejoice in the place which the Lord should choose.

Indeed, I believe that there is hardly a passage in which the phrase occurs where the context does not forbid us to suppose that it has reference to the temple.

84. And let us look to His example who came to

fulfil the law in its minutest points, and who was indeed Himself the very Paschal Lamb. It is impossible to suppose that in that upper chamber where the last real Passover was kept, ere the type was merged in and superseded by the antitype, any essential part of the ceremony should have been omitted.

The fullest narrative, that of the Evangelist St. Mark, is in the following words :—

“And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the Passover, His disciples said unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we go and prepare that Thou mayest eat the Passover? And He sendeth forth two of His disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water : follow him. And wheresoever ye shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the Passover with My disciples? And he will shew you a large upper room furnished and prepared : there make ready for us. And His disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as He had said unto them : and they made ready the Passover. And in the evening He cometh with the twelve. And as they sat and did eat,” &c. Then follow the institution of the Supper of the Lord, the sacred hymn, the evening walk to the Mount of Olives, the betrayal, the cross and passion. (St. Mark xiv. 12—18.)

It appears from this passage that the Israelites who dwelt in the Holy City prepared apartments at the paschal season, that they who came from far might eat the Passover in the place which the Lord their God had chosen to place His name there.

But what hint have we here of any ceremony connected with the temple? The whole observance is kept in the simple primitive style of the original ordinance, with the one single addition that it was kept, not “in any of their gates,” but in the Holy City, the place which God had chosen to place His name there.

85. So far, then, everything connected with the Passover is in minute, consistent harmony. But we are told that there are two passages in the Book of Chronicles

which imply a different mode of celebration. And it is of course by no means improbable that when the temple was erected, with its ample courts and numerous conveniences, the mode of observance may in some respects have been varied.

But before turning to these passages, let us again call to mind the Mosaic ordinances with regard to the Passover. There was the paschal lamb slain by each householder and eaten by each household on the evening of the 14th of Abib; and during the ensuing week there were the Passover offerings, the national burnt-offerings of bullocks, rams and lambs, and goats, whose blood was sprinkled on the altar, and which were afterwards flayed, cut in pieces, and burnt.

86. The first passage in the Book of Chronicles has reference to the great Passover in the reign of King Hezekiah, kept a month later than its proper season, because in the first month the people had not gathered themselves together to Jerusalem.

“Then they killed the Passover on the fourteenth day of the second month: and the priests and the Levites were ashamed, and sanctified themselves, and brought in *the burnt-offerings* into the house of the Lord. And they stood in their place after their manner, according to the law of Moses the man of God: the priests sprinkled the blood, which they received of the hand of the Levites.” (2 Chron. xxx. 15, 16.)

Why, there is nothing here but what we should have expected; nothing to imply a different mode of celebration. The nation offers its burnt-offerings, and the priests sprinkle the blood. This is exactly what they were bound to do according to the law of Moses the man of God. The narrative is in simple conformity with the rest of Scripture.

87. Turn we then to the second reference, the Chroni-



cler's account of the Passover in the reign of King Josiah. (2 Chron. xxxv. 7—18.)

"Josiah gave to the people, of the flock, lambs and kids, all for the Passover offerings, (*eis τὸ φασέκ*), for all that were present, to the number of thirty thousand, and three thousand bullocks." (ver. 7.) These bullocks, at any rate, were not paschal lambs. "And Hilkiah and Zechariah and Jehiel gave unto the priests for the Passover offerings (*eis τὸ φασέκ*) two thousand six hundred small cattle, and three hundred oxen." (ver. 8.) These too were not paschal lambs. "And the chief of the Levites gave unto the Levites for Passover offerings (*eis τὸ φασέκ*) five thousand small cattle, and five hundred oxen." (ver. 9.) Neither were these paschal lambs. "So the service was prepared, and the priests stood in their place, and the Levites in their courses, according to the King's commandment. And they killed the Passover, (*τὸ φασέκ*), and the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands, and the Levites flayed them. And they removed the burnt-offerings." (vers. 10—12.)

This passage no doubt admits of the interpretation that the paschal lambs were slain in the court of the temple, and that the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands. But it is clear that such an interpretation is not necessary, and I do not think it is correct. The sprinkling and flaying was precisely what they had to do, not with the paschal lambs, but with the Passover offerings, the national burnt-offerings, the bullocks, the lambs, the kids, the small cattle and oxen which the King and nobles had so freely supplied. *Their* blood would have to be sprinkled and their carcasses flayed in express obedience to the law of Moses. The "flaying" seems to have been peculiarly appropriate to burnt-offerings. (See *supr.* 70 ; and cf. 2 Chron. xxix. 34, where it is said that the priests were too few to flay the burnt-offerings, wherefore the Levites helped them.) And the words which immediately follow in the text, "And they

removed the burnt-offerings," seem to shew that the Passover offerings mentioned in ver. 11 are the same burnt-offerings which are called by the same name *זֶבַח* in the preceding verses. This brings the whole passage into harmony with the clear and unmistakeable precepts of the law; and with the mode in which Hezekiah's Passover had been celebrated (supr. 86) a century before. The language is on any construction difficult and involved, but I do not think that it warrants our believing that so great an innovation was introduced as that the paschal lambs were flayed by the Levites, and their blood sprinkled by the priests.

88. The plain Scriptural narrative, and I have omitted and suppressed nothing within my knowledge, is hardly recognisable in the narrative of Dr. Colenso.

The point which he undertakes to prove is that at the Passover in the wilderness, each of the three priests, Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar, must have had to sprinkle the blood of 50,000 lambs in about two hours, that is, at the rate of about 400 lambs every minute for two hours together. (Colenso, 159.) Let us examine his arguments *seriatim*.

(1.) "We are told, 2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxv. 11, that the people killed the Passover, but the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands, and the Levites flayed them." (Colenso, 159.)

*Reply.* There really is not a word in 2 Chron. xxx. 16 which justifies this statement, or can with any propriety admit of such a construction. The passage refers in terms not to the paschal lambs, but to the Passover offerings, the national burnt-offerings. And although in 2 Chron xxxv. 11 such a construction is perhaps not an unfair one, yet a comparison of the preceding and following verses with the manner in which King Hezekiah's Passover was kept, seems to shew that it would be *erroneous*, and that this passage also has no reference to the paschal lambs.

But even if it had, what conclusion are we to draw from

hence? I should have supposed that in the later period of the monarchy, after a long disuse of the paschal system, an important innovation had, for convenience or by an oversight, been introduced into the ritual. But this is not Dr. Colenso's conclusion.

(2.) "Hence when they kept the Passover under Sinai, Numb. ix. 5, where we must suppose that 150,000 lambs were killed at one time 'between the two evenings' for the two millions of people, each priest would have had to sprinkle the blood of 50,000 lambs in about two hours." (Colenso, 159.)

*Reply.* If the lambs were ever taken for slaughter to the temple at all, (which I think we have no sufficient reason from Scripture to believe,) it must have been in consequence of that precept in Deuteronomy which directs them to be slain in the place which the Lord should choose. But this precept was delivered with exclusive reference to the land of Canaan, and forty years *after* the Passover under Sinai; it could not therefore have regulated that Passover. And we have also seen that it did not in fact direct them to be slain in the temple at all, but in the Holy City, which would be represented in the wilderness by the camp and not by the tabernacle.

(3.) "Besides which, in the time of Hezekiah and Josiah, when it was desired to keep the Passover strictly "in such sort as it was written," 2 Chron. xxx. 5, the lambs were manifestly killed in the court of the temple." (Colenso, 159.)

*Reply.* Although Dr. Colenso blends the two Passovers together, the passage cited refers only to the Passover in the reign of Hezekiah, where there is nothing even to suggest that the paschal lambs were killed in the court of the temple. And indeed, what ordinance would so have been obeyed? where *is it written* that they should be so killed? Dr. Colenso proceeds to shew.

(4.) "We must suppose, then, that the paschal lambs in the wilderness were killed in the court of the tabernacle, in accordance in fact with the strict injunctions of the Levitical law that all burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings should be killed before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." (Colenso, 159.)

*Reply.* But the paschal lamb was not a burnt-offering; the

paschal lamb was not a peace-offering; the paschal lamb was not a sin-offering; and the paschal lamb was not a trespass-offering.

(5.) "Besides all which, we have this most solemn command laid down in Lev. xvii. 2—6," (Colenso, 160,) and he cites the passage commanding the Israelites, instead of offering their sacrifices in the open field, to bring all their offerings unto the door of the tabernacle, to offer them as peace-offerings unto the Lord, and for the priest to sprinkle the blood and burn the fat upon the altar.

*Reply.* It is not probable that this command was even delivered at the date of the second Passover. (Supr. 77.) But had it, whenever delivered, any reference to the Passover at all? I think that it clearly had none whatever. It is simply the command as to voluntary peace-offerings. It was not even, it could not possibly have been, intended to supersede the rules and regulations already laid down with respect to the offerings *ejusdem generis*—burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and the like. Still less could it have any application to a rite generically distinct, the simple memorial feast of the paschal supper. The scope and object of the command are expressly laid down in the command itself. It was apprehended that if the Israelites were permitted to offer their voluntary sacrifices anywhere, in the open field, (ver. 5,) they might be led to offer them to devils, (ver. 7,) as the people of the land did, and as they themselves had ere now done. They were therefore to bring them to the tabernacle, and to "offer them for peace-offerings before the Lord." If they did not, they should be considered to be guilty of blood. But this has no connection with offerings made under the express authority of a special Divine command, and least of all with the paschal supper. According to the terms of its institution, the blood of the paschal lamb was to be sprinkled on the door-posts, and not on the altar: (it was this very part of the rite, the sign and symbol of the passing over, which was more expressly enjoined as an ordinance for ever; see *infra*, 12:) and so far from the fat having to be burnt upon the altar, the whole of the flesh was to be kept religiously within the house. And the second Passover was specially directed to be kept according to all the rites of it, and according to all the ceremonies thereof. (Numbers ix. 3.) Are we seriously asked to believe that the very essence of this most special institution was, before it had

been kept a second time, silently superseded and repealed, and that too, by a command referring merely to peace-offerings? And if so, where was the necessity for the supplemental order directing them to go up to Jerusalem to keep it?

(6.) "How, in fact, could the priests have sprinkled the blood at all, if this were not the case that the animals were killed in the court of the tabernacle?" (Colenso, 161.)

*Reply.* We do not assent to the point assumed, viz., that the priests *had* to sprinkle the blood at all.

(7.) "If they were required to appear before the Lord (Exodus xxiii. 17; Deut. xvi. 2, 5, 6) when the holy place was so far away from their homes, surely *à fortiori* they were required to do so in the wilderness, when the tabernacle was close at hand." (Colenso, 162.)

*Reply.* This proceeds on the assumption that the holy place was the temple; but we have already shewn that it was the Holy City. (Supr. 83, 84.) Indeed, why should the choice of a holy place be always spoken of as belonging to the future, if the tabernacle already fulfilled that designation? But what if the precept *did* refer to the temple?

There is no room for any *à fortiori* agreement, it is a simple question of fact. They *were* commanded to go up to the holy place in Palestine; they *were not* commanded to do so in the wilderness.

And what are we to think of a reasoner, who because a command is given for a locality where it would have been possible of performance, concludes that it must, "surely *à fortiori*," have been given for a locality where (according to the very point and purport of his argument) it would have involved impossibilities? What wonder if the intelligent Zulu occasionally chafed in mild rebellion beneath such arguments as these?

(8.) "But the command already quoted from Lev. xvii. 2—6, expressly refers to the camp." (Colenso, 162.)

*Reply.* But not to the Passover. (See reply (5); supr.) And as to the camp, see supr. 68. And the command was probably not then in existence.

(9.) "It is expressly said in 2 Chron. xxx. 5, that they had not kept the Passover 'of a long time in such sort as it was written,' so that *all that was done* at this Passover was meant

to be done in express agreement with what was written." (Colenso, 162.)

*Reply.* The chapter referred to does not give us any reason to suppose that the paschal lambs were, in fact, slain in the court of the temple, and their blood sprinkled on the altar. And if this was really done, although it might perhaps have been justified by custom, (if any such custom existed,) yet it would indubitably have been *in direct contravention of what was written* in the law of Moses. However, in this respect the Passover in question seems to have been really kept in such sort as it was written.

But as to the conclusion that "*all* that was done at this Passover was meant to be done in express agreement with what was written," we are distinctly told, not only that it was kept at the wrong time, (2 Chron. xxx. 2—3,) but that in other respects also "*a multitude of the people did eat the Passover otherwise than it was written.*" (ver. 18.) In fact, it would seem that some evil effects ensued from the general disobedience. (ver. 20.)

And as to the Passover of Josiah, the "*flaying*" is nowhere ordered, even in the passage cited from Lev. xvii. It seems to have been the special direction as to burnt-offerings. (Supr. 79, and 2 Chron. xxix. 34.)

(10.) "The command that the blood of the lambs should be smeared on the door-posts of the respective houses could not have been carried out in the desert, where the people lived in tents, and there were no door-posts to be smeared." (Colenso, 164.)

*Reply.* The tents had probably entrances of some kind; and if so, they would of course serve every purpose. It was the entrance of the house which was to be marked, to keep out the angel of death; the command had no connection with any particular form of door-post.

(11.) "Nor could this command have been carried out in the land of Canaan, where the males went up to keep the Passover at the central sanctuary, the tabernacle or the temple." (Colenso, 164.)

*Reply.* This, again, assumes that the holy place was the temple; for the command could easily have been carried out in the land of Canaan, if (as we have already seen was the case) the males went up to keep the Passover in the Holy City, and the citizens made ready, for loan or hire, large guest-chambers for their use.

And Josephus, undoubtedly both a credible and a competent witness of the practice of his own nation in his own day, tells us in plain terms that the command was even then carried out. For after referring to the ordinance of institution, and especially to the sprinkling of the blood from the bunches of hyssop, he expressly says, "and we still keep the Passover after this fashion." (*Antiq.* ii. 14.)

(12.) "But surely it is strange that a command supposed to be Divine should have had to be set aside as impossible to be performed on the very first occasion of the memorial feast being celebrated, more especially as the injunction, 'And ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and thy sons for ever,' seems to have express reference to this very ceremony of smearing the door-posts." (*Colenso*, 164.)

*Reply.* So strange as to be wholly incredible. And really when we come to look at it we find no impossibility or even difficulty in the matter.

89. There seems, then, to be no discrepancy in the Scriptural statements. The paschal laws plainly contemplate no intervention on the part of the priest in the slaughter of the paschal lambs: the historical narrative gives us no sufficient warrant for supposing that such an intervention ever, in fact, existed. And although the traditions of the Jews who flourished after the captivity, after long and repeated cessations in the observance of the Passover, may have encouraged a different practice, yet we know that the traditions of the Jews were not invariably successful in giving effect to the commandments of God. And even if we are called upon to believe that in our Saviour's time, contrary to what we should have supposed from the silence of the Evangelists, the Pharisaic mode of keeping the paschal supper required the intervention of the priest, it is, to say the least, improbable that any such innovation should have been attempted before the captivity; im-

possible that it should have been attempted, and should have succeeded, in the lifetime of the very Lawgiver who had, only one year before, by an ordinance intended for all generations, directed in the most solemn terms another and a totally incompatible mode of celebration.

90. The writer of the 12th chapter of Exodus plainly supposed that he was describing an ordinance which was to last—and which, so far as *he* knew, *did* last—throughout all generations. And if we could be induced to believe that that ordinance was repealed or superseded, and a totally different practice introduced within twelve months from its date, I really do not see how we could escape from the conclusion that the chapter was written within this period of twelve months.

But in truth, Dr. Colenso's suggestion, that this ordinance was repealed before the Passover at Sinai, appears to be a purely gratuitous and unfounded assumption. Its single recommendation would seem to be that it would introduce an impossibility into the narrative. I can see no other semblance of an argument to support it. It is improbable in itself; it is contrary to the whole analogy of the law of God; and there is certainly "no hint of it in Scripture." Dr. Colenso himself admits that "it is certainly true that the references to the Passover in the Books of Exodus and Numbers do not appear to imply in any way that the priests were called into action in the celebration of this feast." (Colenso, 164.) Does not this admission alone put him out of court?

The reader will remember that the question discussed in this chapter has really no concern with the mode of celebration in the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah, or in our Saviour's time; it is simply concerned with the



mode of celebration of the second Passover, that in the wilderness of Sinai. We have considered the original ordinance of institution; it does not enjoin, or permit of, the intervention of the priest. We know that in all probability no further ordinance on the subject was delivered until after the celebration of the second Passover. We have, however, considered all the supplemental ordinances; they do not enjoin, or allude to, the intervention of the priest. We have considered the full narrative of the transaction; it gives no hint of the intervention of the priest. We know, on physical considerations, that there *could* have been no intervention of the priest. And is it criticism, first to insist that, notwithstanding all this, such intervention *must* have taken place, and next to impute absurdity to the historian, on the ground that it could not possibly have taken place?

So far, then, we have found that not one of Dr. Colenso's objections will bear the test of a patient scrutiny. We have found them, in almost every instance, characterized with such unflagging and profuse, though quite unconscious, inaccuracy, that I am at a loss to conceive how any man should have thought himself justified, I do not say in *publishing*, but even in *forming* opinions on so momentous a subject with so little consideration and care. It is easy to believe Dr. Colenso's own assurance (p. xxxii.), that Part I. cost him comparatively slight labour. Not even the labour, it would seem, of making himself acquainted with the very passages which he was about to criticise.

It is, however, but fair to observe that Dr. Colenso prudently disclaims for himself the authorship of these "very convincing" objections. "It is not I," he says, "who make them." And whom does the reader suppose

it to be? The intelligent Christian native? No. The very intelligent Zulu? No. "It is not I, it is the Truth itself" which makes them. (Colenso, 491.)

We have next to consider whether the Truth itself is more accurate in the objections it makes to the narrative of the Exodus.

NOTE.—In 21, (supr.), I said that the Seventy Translators had *retained* the ambiguous phrase "that came with Jacob into Egypt." I should rather have said that they and our own translators have, to a great extent, *introduced* an ambiguity which does not exist in the original text.

Dr. McCaul has already observed that the preposition used is *h*, and that the more correct translation would therefore be, "All the souls belonging to Jacob that came into Egypt."

And with this agree St. Jerome's version, and (I believe) the Chaldee paraphrase.

That this is the correct interpretation may perhaps be gathered even from the Lexicons which give to *h* in this passage the meaning of "together with." Parkhurst, after explaining that the ordinary signification of the preposition is "to," "belonging to," &c., says that it means "together with," here and in Exod. xiv. 28, 1 Chron. xiii. 1; and Gesenius adds, 1 Sam. xxix. 2, 2 Chron. xvi. 8, Ps. lvi. 10, cxviii. 6. But there seems to be hardly one of these passages in which it is necessary to depart from the ordinary meaning.

Diodati's version would therefore appear to be quite correct: "Tutte le persone che vennero in Egitto *appartenenti a Jacob*, procedute dalla sua anca," &c.

It would seem from the fourth edition of Dr. Colenso's work, just published, that the argument of chap. vi. supr. has been partially anticipated, for he now writes with regard to his own "very convincing" objection,—“If the particular direction is laid down, as is argued by some from the context,” (no very unnatural mode of arguing, one would have thought,) “with special reference to a moveable camp of soldiers engaged in a military

expedition, yet how much more necessary must some such provision have been for the vast stationary camp of two millions." (This looks very like one of Dr. Colenso's celebrated *à fortiori* arguments,—If a command is given where it is possible of performance, it must "surely *à fortiori*" have been given where it would have been impossible.) "Or rather, how is it conceivable that such a camp could have existed without any sewage arrangements," &c.

So that the objection on the words of Scripture is wholly surrendered, and we are now invited to discuss this interesting and agreeable problem, What were the sewage arrangements of the Israelites during their year's sojourn before Sinai? In order to discuss this question thoroughly, it would be desirable to collate and compare some similar instances; for example, What have usually been the sewage arrangements in the great migrations of Eastern nations? What in the enormous camps of Scythians, Huns, and Avars? What were the sewage arrangements of the vast Christian and Mussulman armies during the two years' siege of Acre, when the numbers assembled probably very far exceeded the whole population, which at any one time would have been found in the camp of the Israelites? And to come to later times, and to the most civilized nations in the world, What were the sewage arrangements of the English, Russians, French, and Turks, during their year's sojourn around Sebastopol? What are now the sewage arrangements of the continental camps? A minute examination of all these instances might probably either give to Dr. Colenso the exact information he needs, or else furnish him with "very convincing" proofs that all the events referred to are unhistorical and impossible.

*By the same Author.*

---

## THE CLOUDS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Greek Text, with a Translation into Corresponding Metres,  
and Original Notes. Small 4to.

"Not a mere drily correct version, but a spirited piece, which will give the English reader a very good idea of the celebrated 'Clouds,' and what is of more importance, may be perused with pleasure."—*Spectator*.

"A most successful performance. Not only the meaning and metres of Aristophanes are faithfully represented, but also his tone and spirit: his sparkling wit, his pointed raillery, his broad farce, his poetical flights, and the manly vigour of his sober moods. Even the puns, and other almost untranslatable forms of expression, are not lost to the English reader. Excellent notes are appended to the Greek text."—*Athenaeum*.

"A good edition and translation of the 'Clouds.'"—*Dr. Donaldson, (Classical Scholarship and Classical Learning)*.



















